



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

No. 114

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer: God of our forebears in faith, and ever-present Lord of life,

Be with us as we begin this fall session of the 107th Congress.

Bless the families of all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Bless also the workers in district offices and all the people met during summer recess.

Now, help all Members to focus their attention on the priorities set before them by the deepest desires of the American people and the honest dialogue of colleagues in this House.

Encourage them in sincere debate until the best ideas surface.

Guide them to sound resolution on complex issues so that Your Holy Will will be accomplished in our time and bright hope be instilled in Your people.

Grant eternal peace to former Member, The Honorable FLOYD DAVIDSON SPENCE, and former Chaplain, Dr. James David Ford, who died since our last gathering. May their families and friends be surrounded with the consolation and peace which You alone can offer.

May all Americans catch a glimpse of Your glory that they may risk everything to bring about Your Kingdom of truth, justice and love now and forever.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CUMMINGS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2133. An act to establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

H.R. 2620. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2620) "An Act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. KOHL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUE, Mr. BOND, Mr. BURNS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. STEVENS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 238. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies on

water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon.

S. 329. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and for other purposes.

S. 356. An act to establish a National Commission on the Bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase.

S. 491. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the provisions of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project.

S. 498. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 506. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Huna Totem Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 509. An act to establish the Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm National Heritage Corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 584. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse".

S. 737. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, as the "Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office".

S. 970. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, as the "Horatio King Post Office Building".

S. 1026. An act to designate the United States Post Office located at 60 Third Avenue in Long Branch, New Jersey, as the "Pat King Post Office Building".

S. 1046. An act to establish a commission for the purpose of encouraging and providing for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*.

S. 1144. An act to amend title III of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) to reauthorize the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1198. An act to reauthorize Franchise Fund Pilot Programs.

S. Con. Res. 59. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5343

should be established a National Community Health Center Week to raise awareness of health services provided by community, migrant, public housing, and homeless health centers.

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution congratulating Ukraine on the 10th anniversary of the restoration on its independence and supporting its full integration into the Euro-Atlantic community of democracies.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 3, 2001 at 3:40 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2213.

That the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 208.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

DANIEL STRODEL
(For Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House).

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, DC, August 6, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 6, 2001 at 3:50 p.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 93.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 271.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 364.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 427.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 558.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 821.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 988.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1183.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1753.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2043.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MARTHA C. MORRISON
(For Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House).

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2001.

Speaker J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The U.S. House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As a result of my nomination by President George W. Bush and my subsequent confirmation by the U.S. Senate to serve as Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, I hereby resign from the U.S. House of Representatives. This resignation is to be effective at 2400 hours on Monday, August 6, 2001.

Enclosed you will find a copy of my letter to Governor Mike Huckabee of Arkansas stating the same.

Sincerely,

ASA HUTCHINSON.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2001.

Governor MIKE HUCKABEE,
State Capitol Building,
Little Rock, AR.

DEAR GOVERNOR HUCKABEE: Please accept this letter as notice that my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives shall be effective at the 2400 hours on Monday, August 6, 2001.

Sincerely,

ASA HUTCHINSON.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker Pro Tempore WOLF signed the following enrolled bills on Tuesday, August 7, 2001:

H.R. 93, Federal Firefighters Retirement Age Fairness Act;

H.R. 271, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center;

H.R. 364, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Marjory Williams Scrivens Post Office;"

H.R. 427, to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon, and for other purposes;

H.R. 558, to designate the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse;"

H.R. 821, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1030 South Church Street in Asheboro, North Carolina, as the "W. Joe Trogon Post Office Building;"

H.R. 988, to designate the United States Courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse;"

H.R. 1183, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 South Main Street in Sylva, Georgia, as the "G. Elliot Hagan Post Office Building;"

H.R. 1753, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 419 Rutherford Avenue, N.E., in Roanoke, Virginia, as the "M. Caldwell Butler Office Building;"

H.R. 2043, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service lo-

cated at 2719 South Webster Street in Kokomo, Indiana, as the "Elwood Haynes 'Bud' Hillis Post Office Building;"

H.R. 2213, to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American Agricultural Producers.

IN HONOR OF OUR GREAT COLLEAGUES

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Madam Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce to the House of Representatives the death of the late Honorable FLOYD SPENCE of South Carolina on August 16, 2001. His funeral was held in Columbia, South Carolina, on August 21, 2001.

Later today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the dean of the South Carolina delegation, will offer a resolution in memory of our beloved colleague. Members are invited to contact the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) or the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) if they wish to participate in this tribute. Members will be advised of plans for a subsequent Special Order in memory of FLOYD SPENCE. I think we will all remember FLOYD SPENCE for his love of this Nation, his love of this House, and his strong and spirited defense always for the armed services members of this country.

It is also my very sad duty to announce to the House the death of our Chaplain Emeritus, James David Ford on August 27, 2001. Jim Ford had been the beloved Chaplain of the House for 21 years, from 1979 until his retirement in the year 2000. A memorial ceremony honoring Chaplain Ford's life and his service to this House will be held on Tuesday, September 11, at 1 p.m. in the Cannon Caucus Room. I extend my personal condolences to Chaplain Ford's family and his many friends during this time of bereavement.

HEARTFELT CONDOLENCES TO THE RILEY FAMILY

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Madam Speaker, those of us who are privileged to work in this wonderful institution and get to know one another and our families, we should take the time every now and then to reflect on what a great privilege we have to know one another.

Two or three years ago I made a trip to Alabama for BOB RILEY. Lord have mercy, Madam Speaker, I ended up at the wrong airport late, frustrated, tired, and disconcerted. All of a sudden, there appeared right there in the lobby of that airport two beautiful ladies: BOB's wonderful wife, Patsy, and his beautiful daughter, Jenice. They resolved that they would get me to my

appointed round on time, and I have kidded with the two ladies for years afterwards about how it was such a pleasure to see so much of Alabama, but I had not known it was a blur, as Jenice drove that car.

Jenice, a beautiful child, and clearly the apple of her daddy's eye, was at that time and since having a very private battle with cancer. Most of us did not know that because she was so cheerful. This child would lift my spirits on the occasions that I saw her. She was always upbeat, always happy, always optimistic, always enthusiastic, always full of praise for her Lord.

Madam Speaker, she was taken from us during this recess period to heaven. I know it hurts BOB and Patsy and all of us that had the privilege of knowing this wonderful young lady.

Madam Speaker, I rise at this moment to say, for what little comfort I can offer BOB and Patsy, no eye has ever seen, no mind can know the glory and the beauty of Jenice today. As our Lord and Savior told us, if it were not true, I would have told you. Your loss is felt and shared by all of us.

KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO THE COAST GUARD

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, as a new Member of this body, let me extend my condolences to the majority leader on the loss that he has suffered.

Madam Speaker, during the August recess, I joined the United States Coast Guard Fire Island Station for a tour of erosion areas on the south shore of my district. As we returned to the station, the Coast Guard received a report of a swimmer in distress. Coast Guard personnel risked their lives that day, despite turbulent waters and an incoming storm to save another life.

Imagine my surprise, Madam Speaker, to learn that many of those same courageous men and women are forced to take part-time jobs because their rate of pay is too low and the cost of housing and health care on Long Island is too high. Some of those people go from saving lives and property during the day to serving pizza and waiting on tables at night.

□ 1415

Madam Speaker, it is not sufficient merely to pay tribute to the men and women of the Coast Guard. We have to pay them living wages for protecting our shores and saving our lives.

As a new Member of the House Coast Guard Caucus, I am honored to join my colleagues in our efforts to keep our promises to those who protect our lives and our shores with fair pay, decent housing, and affordable health care.

CONDOLENCES TO THE FAMILY OF THE REVEREND JIM FORD

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my condolences to the family of Reverend Jim Ford. Jim was a very, very good personal friend of mine and many of us in this House. He served the House for over 20 years with great distinction; and in serving the people that work in this House, including the Members and the staff, he served his country very well.

He was a very proud man. He cared very much about the House of Representatives, the Members who are sent here. His service to this House and to his country will long be remembered because it was a service of distinction and integrity, and really trying to help Members and families get through troubled times, but also bringing people together through the marriages that he performed for a number of Members.

So we will long remember our friend, Jim Ford, and our condolences go out to his family for the loss that they have incurred. We wish Godspeed to Reverend Ford. He will long be remembered in the halls of the House of Representatives.

CONDOLENCES TO FAMILY OF THE REVEREND JIM FORD

(Mr. COBLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I, too, want to join my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) in remembering Jim Ford.

Tom Bliley, a recently retired Member from Virginia, and I and other Members would play tennis frequently with Chaplain Ford. I really came to know him, Madam Speaker, on the tennis court rather than within these halls.

He used to have a shot: He would put an obvious spin on the ball. When the ball would strike the surface of the court, it would be virtually impossible to gauge in what direction it would go. Jim Ford called that his squirrel shot, and Bliley and I used to refer to that as Chaplain Ford's patented squirrel shot.

Madam Speaker, we have an outstanding Chaplain in Father Dan. We had an outstanding Chaplain in Jim Ford. We want to remember Mrs. Ford and the children in this hour of grief.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on postponed questions will be taken after debate has

concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2291) to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program for an additional 5 years, to authorize a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2291

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the next 15 years, the youth population in the United States will grow by 21 percent, adding 6,500,000 youth to the population of the United States. Even if drug use rates remain constant, there will be a huge surge in drug-related problems, such as academic failure, drug-related violence, and HIV incidence, simply due to this population increase.

(2) According to the 1994–1996 National Household Survey, 60 percent of students age 12 to 17 who frequently cut classes and who reported delinquent behavior in the past 6 months used marijuana 52 days or more in the previous year.

(3) The 2000 Washington Kids Count survey conducted by the University of Washington reported that students whose peers have little or no involvement with drinking and drugs have higher math and reading scores than students whose peers had low level drinking or drug use.

(4) Substance abuse prevention works. In 1999, only 10 percent of teens saw marijuana users as popular, compared to 17 percent in 1998 and 19 percent in 1997. The rate of past-month use of any drug among 12- to 17-year-olds declined 26 percent between 1997 and 1999. Marijuana use for sixth through eighth graders is at the lowest point in 5 years, as is use of cocaine, inhalants, and hallucinogens.

(5) Community Anti-Drug Coalitions throughout the United States are successfully developing and implementing comprehensive, long-term strategies to reduce substance abuse among youth on a sustained basis. For example:

(A) The Boston Coalition brought college and university presidents together to create the Cooperative Agreement on Underage Drinking. This agreement represents the first coordinated effort of Boston's many institutions of higher education to address issues such as binge drinking, underage drinking, and changing the norms surrounding alcohol abuse that exist on college and university campuses.

(B) In 2000, the Coalition for a Drug-Free Greater Cincinnati surveyed more than 47,000 local students in grades 7 through 12. The results provided evidence that the Coalition's initiatives are working. For the first time in a decade, teen drug use in Greater Cincinnati appears to be leveling off. The data collected from the survey has served as a tool to strengthen relationships between schools and communities, as well as facilitate the growth of anti-drug coalitions in communities where such coalitions had not existed.

(C) The Miami Coalition used a three-part strategy to decrease the percentage of high school seniors who reported using marijuana at least once during the most recent 30-day period. The development of a media strategy, the creation of a network of prevention agencies, and

discussions with high school students about the dangers of marijuana all contributed to a decrease in the percentage of seniors who reported using marijuana from over 22 percent in 1995 to 9 percent in 1997. The Miami Coalition was able to achieve these results while national rates of marijuana use were increasing.

(D) The Nashville Prevention Partnership worked with elementary and middle school children in an attempt to influence them toward positive life goals and discourage them from using substances. The Partnership targeted an area in East Nashville and created after school programs, mentoring opportunities, attendance initiatives, and safe passages to and from school. Attendance and test scores increased as a result of the program.

(E) At a youth-led town meeting sponsored by the Bering Strait Community Partnership in Nome, Alaska, youth identified a need for a safe, substance-free space. With help from a variety of community partners, the Partnership staff and youth members created the Java Hut, a substance-free coffeehouse designed for youth. The Java Hut is helping to change norms in the community by providing a fun, youth-friendly atmosphere and activities that are not centered around alcohol or marijuana.

(F) Portland's Regional Drug Initiative (RDI) has promoted the establishment of drug-free workplaces among the city's large and small employers. Over 3,000 employers have attended an RDI training session, and of those, 92 percent have instituted drug-free workplace policies. As a result, there has been a 5.5 percent decrease in positive workplace drug tests.

(G) San Antonio Fighting Back worked to increase the age at which youth first used illegal substances. Research suggests that the later the age of first use, the lower the risk that a young person will become a regular substance abuser. As a result, the age of first illegal drug use increased from 9.4 years in 1992 to 13.5 years in 1997.

(H) In 1990, multiple data sources confirmed a trend of increased alcohol use by teenagers in the Troy community. Using its "multiple strategies over multiple sectors" approach, the Troy Coalition worked with parents, physicians, students, coaches, and others to address this problem from several angles. As a result, the rate of twelfth grade students who had consumed alcohol in the past month decreased from 62.1 percent to 53.3 percent between 1991 and 1998, and the rate of eighth grade students decreased from 26.3 percent to 17.4 percent. The Troy Coalition believes that this decline represents not only a change in behavior on the part of students, but also a change in the norms of the community.

(6) Despite these successes, drug use continues to be a serious problem facing communities across the United States. For example:

(A) According to the Pulse Check: Trends in Drug Abuse Mid-Year 2000 report—

(i) crack and powder cocaine remains the most serious drug problem;

(ii) marijuana remains the most widely available illicit drug, and its potency is on the rise;

(iii) treatment sources report an increase in admissions with marijuana as the primary drug of abuse—and adolescents outnumber other age groups entering treatment for marijuana;

(iv) 80 percent of Pulse Check sources reported increased availability of club drugs, with ecstasy (MDMA) and ketamine the most widely cited club drugs and seven sources reporting that powder cocaine is being used as a club drug by young adults;

(v) ecstasy abuse and trafficking is expanding, no longer confined to the "rave" scene;

(vi) the sale and use of club drugs has grown from nightclubs and raves to high schools, the streets, neighborhoods, open venues, and younger ages;

(vii) ecstasy users often are unknowingly purchasing adulterated tablets or some other substance sold as MDMA; and

(viii) along with reports of increased heroin snorting as a route of administration for initi-

ates, there is also an increase in injecting initiates and the negative health consequences associated with injection (for example, increases in HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C) suggesting that there is a generational forgetting of the dangers of injection of the drug.

(B) The 2000 Parent's Resource Institute for Drug Education study reported that 23.6 percent of children in the sixth through twelfth grades used illicit drugs in the past year. The same study found that monthly usage among this group was 15.3 percent.

(C) According to the 2000 Monitoring the Future study, the use of ecstasy among eighth graders increased from 1.7 percent in 1999 to 3.1 percent in 2000, among tenth graders from 4.4 percent to 5.4 percent, and from 5.6 percent to 8.2 percent among twelfth graders.

(D) A 1999 Mellman Group study found that—

(i) 56 percent of the population in the United States believed that drug use was increasing in 1999;

(ii) 92 percent of the population viewed illegal drug use as a serious problem in the United States; and

(iii) 73 percent of the population viewed illegal drug use as a serious problem in their communities.

(7) According to the 2001 report of the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University entitled "Shoveling Up: The Impact of Substance Abuse on State Budgets", using the most conservative assumption, in 1998 States spent \$77,900,000,000 to shovel up the wreckage of substance abuse, only \$3,000,000,000 to prevent and treat the problem and \$433,000,000 for alcohol and tobacco regulation and compliance. This \$77,900,000,000 burden was distributed as follows:

(A) \$30,700,000,000 in the justice system (77 percent of justice spending).

(B) \$16,500,000,000 in education costs (10 percent of education spending).

(C) \$15,200,000,000 in health costs (25 percent of health spending).

(D) \$7,700,000,000 in child and family assistance (32 percent of child and family assistance spending).

(E) \$5,900,000,000 in mental health and developmental disabilities (31 percent of mental health spending).

(F) \$1,500,000,000 in public safety (26 percent of public safety spending) and \$400,000,000 for the state workforce.

(8) Intergovernmental cooperation and coordination through national, State, and local or tribal leadership and partnerships are critical to facilitate the reduction of substance abuse among youth in communities across the United States.

(9) Substance abuse is perceived as a much greater problem nationally than at the community level. According to a 2001 study sponsored by The Pew Charitable Trusts, between 1994 and 2000—

(A) there was a 43 percent increase in the percentage of Americans who felt progress was being made in the war on drugs at the community level;

(B) only 9 percent of Americans say drug abuse is a "crisis" in their neighborhood, compared to 27 percent who say this about the nation; and

(C) the percentage of those who felt we lost ground in the war on drugs on a community level fell by more than a quarter, from 51 percent in 1994 to 37 percent in 2000.

(b) EXTENSION AND INCREASE OF PROGRAM.—Section 1024(a) of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1524(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

"(5) \$50,600,000 for fiscal year 2002;

"(6) \$60,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

"(7) \$70,000,000 for fiscal year 2004;

"(8) \$80,000,000 for fiscal year 2005;

"(9) \$90,000,000 for fiscal year 2006; and

"(10) \$99,000,000 for fiscal year 2007."

(c) EXTENSION OF LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—Section 1024(b) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1524(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following new paragraph (5):

"(5) 6 percent for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2007."

(d) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.—Section 1032(b) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1532(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) ADDITIONAL GRANTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (F), the Administrator may award an additional grant under this paragraph to an eligible coalition awarded a grant under paragraph (1) or (2) for any first fiscal year after the end of the 4-year period following the period of the initial grant under paragraph (1) or (2), as the case may be.

"(B) SCOPE OF GRANTS.—A coalition awarded a grant under paragraph (1) or (2), including a renewal grant under such paragraph, may not be awarded another grant under such paragraph, and is eligible for an additional grant under this section only under this paragraph.

"(C) NO PRIORITY FOR APPLICATIONS.—The Administrator may not afford a higher priority in the award of an additional grant under this paragraph than the Administrator would afford the applicant for the grant if the applicant were submitting an application for an initial grant under paragraph (1) or (2) rather than an application for a grant under this paragraph.

"(D) RENEWAL GRANTS.—Subject to subparagraph (F), the Administrator may award a renewal grant to a grant recipient under this paragraph for each of the fiscal years of the 4-fiscal-year period following the fiscal year for which the initial additional grant under subparagraph (A) is awarded in an amount not to exceed amounts as follows:

"(i) For the first and second fiscal years of that 4-fiscal-year period, the amount equal to 80 percent of the non-Federal funds, including in-kind contributions, raised by the coalition for the applicable fiscal year.

"(ii) For the third and fourth fiscal years of that 4-fiscal-year period, the amount equal to 67 percent of the non-Federal funds, including in-kind contributions, raised by the coalition for the applicable fiscal year.

"(E) SUSPENSION.—If a grant recipient under this paragraph fails to continue to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a), the Administrator may suspend the grant, after providing written notice to the grant recipient and an opportunity to appeal.

"(F) LIMITATION.—The amount of a grant award under this paragraph may not exceed \$100,000 for a fiscal year."

(e) DATA COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.—Section 1033(b) of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1533(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall carry out activities under this subsection in consultation with the Advisory Commission and the National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute."

(f) LIMITATION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM.—Section 1033(b) of that Act, as amended by subsection (e) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) LIMITATION ON USE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAM.—Amounts for activities under paragraph (2)(B) may not be derived from amounts under section 1024(a) except for amounts that are available under section 1024(b) for administrative costs."

(g) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR COALITIONS REPRESENTING CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.—Section 1032 of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1532) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR COALITIONS REPRESENTING CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS.—Funds appropriated for the substance abuse activities of a coalition that includes a representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, or a tribal government agency with expertise in the field of substance abuse may be counted as non-Federal funds raised by the coalition for purposes of this section.”

(h) PRIORITY IN AWARDING GRANTS.—Section 1032 of that Act (21 U.S.C. 1532) is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) PRIORITY IN AWARDING GRANTS.—In awarding grants under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i), priority shall be given to a coalition serving economically disadvantaged areas.”

SEC. 2. SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR COALITION MENTORING ACTIVITIES UNDER DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM.

Subchapter 1 of chapter 2 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 1035. SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR COALITION MENTORING ACTIVITIES.

“(a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS.—As part of the program established under section 1031, the Director may award an initial grant under this subsection, and renewal grants under subsection (f), to any coalition awarded a grant under section 1032 that meets the criteria specified in subsection (d) in order to fund coalition mentoring activities by such coalition in support of the program.

“(b) TREATMENT WITH OTHER GRANTS.—

“(1) SUPPLEMENT.—A grant awarded to a coalition under this section is in addition to any grant awarded to the coalition under section 1032.

“(2) REQUIREMENT FOR BASIC GRANT.—A coalition may not be awarded a grant under this section for a fiscal year unless the coalition was awarded a grant or renewal grant under section 1032(b) for that fiscal year.

“(c) APPLICATION.—A coalition seeking a grant under this section shall submit to the Administrator an application for the grant in such form and manner as the Administrator may require.

“(d) CRITERIA.—A coalition meets the criteria specified in this subsection if the coalition—

“(1) has been in existence for at least 5 years;

“(2) has achieved, by or through its own efforts, measurable results in the prevention and treatment of substance abuse among youth;

“(3) has staff or members willing to serve as mentors for persons seeking to start or expand the activities of other coalitions in the prevention and treatment of substance abuse;

“(4) has demonstrable support from some members of the community in which the coalition mentoring activities to be supported by the grant under this section are to be carried out; and

“(5) submits to the Administrator a detailed plan for the coalition mentoring activities to be supported by the grant under this section.

“(e) USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—A coalition awarded a grant under this section shall use the grant amount for mentoring activities to support and encourage the development of new, self-supporting community coalitions that are focused on the prevention and treatment of substance abuse in such new coalitions' communities. The mentoring coalition shall encourage such development in accordance with the plan submitted by the mentoring coalition under subsection (d)(5).

“(f) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Administrator may make a renewal grant to any coalition awarded a grant under subsection (a), or a previous renewal grant under this subsection, if the coalition, at the time of application for such renewal grant—

“(1) continues to meet the criteria specified in subsection (d); and

“(2) has made demonstrable progress in the development of one or more new, self-supporting community coalitions that are focused on the prevention and treatment of substance abuse.

“(g) GRANT AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the total amount of grants awarded to a coalition under this section for a fiscal year may not exceed the amount of non-Federal funds raised by the coalition, including in-kind contributions, for that fiscal year. Funds appropriated for the substance abuse activities of a coalition that includes a representative of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Indian Health Service, or a tribal government agency with expertise in the field of substance abuse may be counted as non-Federal funds raised by the coalition.

“(2) INITIAL GRANTS.—The amount of the initial grant awarded to a coalition under subsection (a) may not exceed \$75,000.

“(3) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The total amount of renewal grants awarded to a coalition under subsection (f) for any fiscal year may not exceed \$75,000.

“(h) FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR GRANTS.—The total amount available for grants under this section, including renewal grants under subsection (f), in any fiscal year may not exceed the amount equal to five percent of the amount authorized to be appropriated by section 1024(a) for that fiscal year.

“(i) PRIORITY IN AWARDING INITIAL GRANTS.—In awarding initial grants under this section, priority shall be given to a coalition that expressly proposes to provide mentorship to a coalition or aspiring coalition serving economically disadvantaged areas.”

SEC. 3. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES.

Section 1048 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1548) is amended by striking “2002” and inserting “2007”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION FOR NATIONAL COMMUNITY ANTIDRUG COALITION INSTITUTE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy may, using amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (d), make a grant to an eligible organization to provide for the establishment of a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute.

(b) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—An organization eligible for the grant under subsection (a) is any national nonprofit organization that represents, provides technical assistance and training to, and has special expertise and broad, national-level experience in community antidrug coalitions under section 1032 of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1532).

(c) USE OF GRANT AMOUNT.—The organization receiving the grant under subsection (a) shall establish a National Community Antidrug Coalition Institute to—

(1) provide education, training, and technical assistance for coalition leaders and community teams, with emphasis on the development of coalitions serving economically disadvantaged areas;

(2) develop and disseminate evaluation tools, mechanisms, and measures to better assess and document coalition performance measures and outcomes; and

(3) bridge the gap between research and practice by translating knowledge from research into practical information.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for purposes of activities under this section, including the grant under subsection (a), amounts as follows:

(1) For each of fiscal years 2002 and 2003, \$2,000,000.

(2) For each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005, \$1,000,000.

(3) For each of fiscal years 2006 and 2007, \$750,000.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION AGAINST DUPLICATION OF EFFORT.

The Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall ensure that the same or similar activities are not carried out, through the use of funds for administrative costs provided under subchapter II of the National Narcotics Leadership Act of 1988 (21 U.S.C. 1521 et seq.) or funds provided under section 4 of this Act, by more than one recipient of such funds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2291.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate and an honor that the first legislation we are to address upon our return is to fund community-based drug prevention programs. Nothing is tearing at the social fabric of our Nation like the abuse of illegal narcotics and alcohol.

Madam Speaker, the Drug-Free Communities Support Program Reauthorization Act is one of the cornerstones of our national strategy to reduce the demand for illegal drugs; and its reauthorization has strong bipartisan support, not only here in the House, but also in communities across the Nation.

The bill is also a priority for the Bush administration. The Drug-Free Communities Support Program, administered by the Office of National Drug Control Policy, works to prevent drug use among youth at the community level by providing Federal financial incentives for coalitions to join together at the local level to keep their children from using drugs.

This legislation will reauthorize the program for 5 years through fiscal year 2007 and improve the services provided to grantees in several important ways.

I would like to thank the primary House sponsors of this bill, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), as well as the primary Senate sponsors, Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BIDEN, for their bipartisan and bicameral leadership on this bill.

I would also like to thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), for his work on the bill, and particularly for his efforts to ensure that drug-free communities' assistance reaches economically disadvantaged areas.

Madam Speaker, prevention and treatment is probably the most challenging area of our Nation's narcotic

strategy, largely because it remains so difficult to determine with certainty which strategies and programs work and which do not.

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program, however, is one of the few programs which have clearly had a meaningful impact on reducing drug abuse by our youth, and it deserves not only our strong support but also the significant increases in authorized funding which are provided in the bill.

The program today assists 307 communities in 49 States, from Ketchikan, Alaska to Kauai, Hawaii; from Old Town, Maine to Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and to San Juan, Puerto Rico, all of which raise the majority of their funds from the private sector rather than from government grants.

I would like to highlight two coalitions from my district with which I am very familiar: Drug-Free Noble County and the United Way of Allen County, both in northeast Indiana.

In Fort Wayne, multiple groups, including faith-based organizations, have joined together to help prevent usage of illegal narcotics. Drug-Free Noble County, under the commendable leadership of Judge Michael Kramer and Barry Humble, won national recognition for the excellence of his PRIDE program, which was supported by Drug-Free Communities Support funds.

Rural communities often do not have the resources to adequately address drug prevention issues, and the success of the Drug-Free Noble County program demonstrates how this program helps build meaningful partnerships between local grass roots coalitions and the Federal government in such rural and small town areas.

We also know that the Drug-Free Communities Support Program can make a meaningful difference from the results obtained by other coalitions nationwide. In Miami, the percentage of seniors who reported using marijuana dropped from over 22 percent in 1995 to 9 percent in 1997.

In San Antonio, the average age of first illegal drug use among teens increased from 9.4 years in 1992 to 13.5 years in 1997. In Nashville, school attendance and test scores rose measurably as a result of the efforts of the Nashville Prevention Partnership.

All of these successes support not only the reauthorization of the program, but also increased funding. This bill supports President Bush's request to increase the authorization from \$43.5 million to \$50.6 million in fiscal year 2002, accompanied by steady increases each year through fiscal year 2007.

This program has had steadily increasing interest from communities across the Nation looking for assistance with community anti-drug efforts. Our purpose in increasing the authorized funding in this bill was to ensure that adequate funds would be available for grants to deserving communities.

We have also encouraged ONDCP, as well as our oversight committee, to conduct careful evaluation and over-

sight to ensure that the increased funding does not dilute the recognized quality of drug-free communities support programs or coalitions.

The bill also provides for several improvements to the Drug-Free Communities Support Program over the next 5 years, each of which is aimed at improving the quality of services to be offered to grantees and local coalitions.

First, we have provided for additional grants to be made available to successful coalitions for the purpose of mentoring prospective new coalitions. The program was always intended as one which would foster grass roots anti-drug activity and interaction, and I believe that this new provision will work to achieve that goal.

Also, experience has shown that successful coalitions have already been enlisted to help others in neighboring areas build their own program. It is not fair to ask the taxpayers of those areas to bear the cost for others. I believe that Federal assistance is appropriate.

Second, the bill provides for the creation and modest funding to initially support a new Community Antidrug Coalitions Institute to act as a national clearinghouse for technical assistance and training to be provided to local coalitions.

Just as with the grants to the coalitions themselves, the institute is eventually intended to be financed entirely by the private sector. Given the significant increase in the prospective number of coalitions, the committee believed that the creation of the institute was a good and prudent step to ensure the continued quality and effectiveness of the work of the drug-free communities participants.

I would finally like to highlight a couple of additional issues which were addressed in the subcommittee and full committee and are reflected in the reported bill which is the committee amendment under consideration this afternoon.

First, although each of the new entities we are creating to assist grantees is needed and appropriate, it is important to ensure that there is no duplication of effort among the several entities that will now be providing assistance, and the committee amendment directs ONDCP to take steps to prevent such duplication.

Second, the subcommittee has reduced the proposed increase in the current 3 percent statutory cap for administrative expenses from 8 percent down to 6 percent. An analysis of this issue is available in the committee's report. We wanted to ensure, however, that the maximum possible amount of funding in fact is to go to community coalitions.

I very much appreciate the willingness of the bill's sponsors to work with us on this issue.

Third, the committee bill includes an amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), which I supported, to ensure that drug-free communities assistance is targeted to economically disadvantaged areas.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Chairman TAUZIN), of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for working with us to move this bill quickly to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD an exchange of correspondence regarding the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

The material referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2001.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BURTON: I am writing with regard to H.R. 2291, which the Committee on Government Reform ordered reported on July 25, 2001. The Committee on Energy and Commerce was named as an additional Committee of jurisdiction upon the bill's introduction.

I recognize your desire to bring this bill before the House in an expeditious manner. Accordingly, I will not exercise the Committee's right to exercise its referral. By agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, however, the Energy and Commerce Committee does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 2291. In addition, the Energy and Commerce Committee reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this or similar legislation. I ask for your commitment to support any request by the Energy and Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 2291 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter as a part of the Committee's report on H.R. 2291 and in the Congressional Record during debate on its provisions. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2001.

Hon. W.J. "BILLY" TAUZIN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter of July 30, 2001, regarding H.R. 2291, a bill to extend the authorization of the Drug-Free Communities Support Program.

I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions of this legislation, and I appreciate your decision not to exercise your referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing your right to consider this legislation, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. I will also support your Committee's request to seek conferees on provisions of the bill that fall within your jurisdiction, should the bill go to a House-Senate conference. Further, as you requested, this exchange of letters will be included in the Committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record as part of the floor debate.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman.

Madam Speaker, the Drug-Free Communities Act is one of the most successful demand reduction programs and

has had a meaningful impact on local communities across the country. I strongly support its reauthorization and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, as the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, it gives me great pleasure to express my wholehearted support of H.R. 2291, which authorizes the highly successful and highly popular Drug-Free Communities Support Program for an additional 5 years.

From its original enactment in 1997, the Drug-Free Communities Act has enjoyed remarkable bipartisan support in Congress. The concept of providing direct matching grants and technical assistance to community-based coalitions with a demonstrated will and capacity to combat substance abuse has broad appeal to Members on both sides of the aisle.

Communities across the country have rallied to the challenge by making a long-term commitment to fighting substance abuse through broad-based community anti-drug coalitions. The Drug-Free Communities Support Program is unique and important because it recognizes that substance abuse does not just affect individual users and their loved ones. Substance abuse has a cumulative impact on communities in every aspect of community life.

No one has a better reason or incentive to fight the spread of substance abuse than the people who live, work, and serve in those communities.

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program reinforces this inherent incentive, encouraging all sectors of a community to coalesce at the grass roots level around the objective of substance abuse prevention and anti-drug education. The bill before us both renews and amplifies our commitment to this approach.

H.R. 2291 reflects a great deal of time and effort put forth by the bill's authors, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), and Senators GRASSLEY and BIDEN, who have worked hand-in-hand with the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Community Anti-drug Coalitions of America to produce a bill that, like the original Drug-Free Communities Act, deserves the support of all Members in this body.

Their collective efforts have given us a bill that not only provides for a 5-year extension of the existing Drug-Free Communities-based Grant Program, but also significantly increases the funding levels for the program in fiscal year 2002 and in each of the out-years.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) must be congratulated for his

efforts in making this a priority of our subcommittee; and I do appreciate, and I know our entire committee and this Congress appreciates, the bipartisan spirit in which he led us through the process of bringing this bill.

□ 1430

As we put it out of committee, moreover, the bill incorporates an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a fellow member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, that further augments the authorization levels for fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007.

Increasing the authorization levels will afford us the flexibility to allow the program to expand, to meet greater-than-expected demands should that circumstance arise. Apart from providing for additional grant money, H.R. 2291 also augments the existing grant program in three very important ways. First, it authorizes coalitions that have completed the 5-year funding cycle to apply immediately for renewal grants subject to an increased match requirement. Second, it creates a new supplemental mentoring program to enable mature coalitions to mentor young and emerging ones. Third, it provides an additional \$2 million to establish a national community anti-drug coalition institute for the purpose of stimulating new coalition activity and disseminating state-of-the-art research and technical assistance to coalitions nationally.

In my view, Madam Speaker, the goals of providing mentoring support to emerging coalitions and stimulating new coalition activity are especially important because, in spite of the program's success to date, not all communities affected by the problems of substance abuse have been able to participate in a drug-free community support program. Indeed, even while the increased funding levels in H.R. 2291 will enable more eligible coalitions to participate, more money alone will not undo the hard truth described in the timeless song, "God Bless the Child." "Them that's got shall have. Them that's not shall lose."

Sadly, Madam Speaker, that poignant lyric aptly describes the tragic plight of many economically disadvantaged communities that are in the most desperate need of assistance in their fight against the dreadful menace of substance abuse.

A case in point is my own district in Baltimore City. Few, if any, areas in the Nation have been as severely affected by the scourge of drugs as some of the neighborhoods that I represent in Baltimore. Yet despite serious efforts to establish and maintain a community anti-drug coalition capable of qualifying for a drug-free communities matching grant, no funding has yet been awarded to a coalition in the Baltimore area.

At the same time, Madam Speaker, it is plainly ironic and clearly problematic from a public policy standpoint

that the very devastation caused by substance abuse also places communities like Baltimore City at serious disadvantage when it comes to qualifying for matching grants. I tell my colleagues firsthand that the lack of drug-free communities coalition in Baltimore City is by no means a function of insufficient will. Fundamentally, it is a question of resources.

We must find a way to enable disadvantaged communities to exercise their will to make their neighborhoods and keep their young children drug-free. An amendment that I authored during the mark up of H.R. 2291 in the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources seeks to address this problem. Quite simply, its provisions amend the original bill to target base grants, supplemental mentoring grants, and institute support to coalitions that seek to serve economically disadvantaged areas.

By giving priorities to such coalitions, economically depressed areas such as my own district in Baltimore City can begin to reap the benefits that the drug-free community support program is providing already to hundreds of communities across this great Nation.

In closing, Madam Speaker, I wanted to congratulate the bill's authors for their hard work. I also thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), for his support of H.R. 2291 and for assisting with my amendment.

I look forward to our moving H.R. 2291 a step closer to enactment today. I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this very, very important and effective legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) whose efforts in Cincinnati were an early model for this and who, without his persistence at a time when Congress was not adapting too many new programs, managed to move this bill through and is really the father of this legislation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his strong support of this program.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2291, legislation introduced with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) to reauthorize the Drug-free Communities Act. This legislation is both bipartisan and bicameral. We have worked very closely with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BIDEN to draft this reauthorization. I would like to thank and credit all of them for their efforts in bringing this consensus bill to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr.

SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources for their strong personal commitment to reducing substance abuse in their communities and around this country. They bring a lot of knowledge and passion to this issue, also for their good work to improve this legislation as it worked through the process. I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) to not just improve the legislation, but to move it expeditiously through the subcommittee and through the committee and also to achieve a waiver from another important committee of this Congress to get this to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, almost every American family has felt the pain of substance abuse. We are here to talk about a very positive, proactive approach to lessening that pain. The Drug-free Communities Act is an innovative program first established in 1997. It establishes a matching grant program to support and encourage local communities that have shown that they have a comprehensive, long-term commitment to reducing substance abuse among young people. The grants which have to be matched dollar for dollar with non-Federal resources, have now been awarded directly to 307 of these community coalitions in 49 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

The drug-free communities act takes a very different approach than this Congress has taken in the past on the so-called war on drugs. Instead of trading new Federal bureaucracies, instead of looking for solutions outside of our borders, this legislation and program deals directly with local coalitions working to reduce the demand for drugs in communities through effective education and prevention. And it is working.

Coalitions are successful because they devise prevention strategies and methods specific to the communities and because they are inclusive, involving all of those who influence a young person's decisions.

In his Rose Garden speech announcing the new nominee for ONDCP director, the President made the point well that the most effective way to reduce the supply of drugs to America is to dry up the demand. He specifically mentioned the Drug-free Communities Act as an effective tool to achieve demand reduction.

I am pleased to say that these community-based coalitions around the country are making real progress. In my own community in Cincinnati, the coalition for drug-free Greater Cincinnati has now trained over 6,000 parents in how to talk to their children about drugs and have launched a new program to reach even more parents. We have partnered with local TV, radio and print media to implement one of the most aggressive anti-drug media

campaigns in the country. Last year alone, over \$1 million of free public-service time was donated to our effort.

We also fielded the most comprehensive drug use survey ever done in our area to make sure our efforts are truly targeted. Our own survey shows there is a very strong correlation between the number of ads our teens see, these public-service ads, and their choice to remain substance free. We have also spearheaded the faith community initiative which has trained over 100 local congregations to implement substance abuse prevention programs in their churches, mosques and synagogues.

Our student Congress now involves young people from over 25 junior and senior high schools. They are ambassadors who go back to their schools and promote Teen Institute and other good programs in the schools at the peer level. Our drug-free work-place task force has led to over 100 new certified drug-free work places in our area alone.

These are the types of efforts, Madam Speaker, this legislation can help spread throughout our Nation.

H.R. 2291 continues funding for the Drug-Free Communities Act through fiscal year 2007. It also authorizes a new national anti-drug coalition institute which provides needed education, training and technical assistance to coalitions. The institute will be vital, I believe, in developing and disseminating evaluation and testing mechanisms to assist coalitions in the very important and sometimes overlooked area of measuring and assessing our performance in the area of prevention.

The ultimate goal of the Drug-free Communities Act is to get as much bang for the buck as possible and to send dollars and assistance directly into community efforts with a minimal amount being spent on administrative expenses. I am thus pleased that the bill continues to cap administrative costs at a modest level, although some adjustments were made that I think were probably necessary.

It is important to keep in mind that the Drug-free Communities Act was intended to be a catalyst for communities and not a steady stream of funding to cover coalition operating expenses. Therefore, coalitions must start over and reapply for drug-free community grants after an initial 5-year period and must match 125 percent of any new grants, not just 100 percent. Thereafter, it goes up to a 150 percent match. This in effect will encourage coalitions to grow their programs and become less reliant on Federal dollars.

Madam Speaker, some of our larger, more successful coalitions spend a lot of time sharing information and practices with smaller, sometimes-struggling coalitions. That, and trying to get off the ground by these smaller coalitions, is a real struggle.

I am pleased this bill acknowledges this and builds on it. H.R. 2291 includes an optional \$75,000 supplemental to the

drug-free communities grant application that would foster mentoring among these coalitions. These grants are meant to supercede the basic drug-free communities grant program, and only those meeting very strict criteria will be eligible to be mentors. By the way, this is capped at 5 percent of the total funding.

The bill also includes language suggested by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) that will ensure that economically depressed areas will continue to be served by the drug-free communities program. We talked about that a moment ago. Specifically, that will be helpful when it comes to mentoring. I applaud the gentleman for his efforts in this area.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I want to thank once again the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BIDEN, and of course my partner in this, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), for crafting a bill that will continue to redo the demand for drugs in America through what we know works. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the continuation of this effective approach to substance abuse.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Madam Speaker, I begin by thanking the sponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), for their leadership on this very critical issue.

I am very pleased today to rise in support of this legislation because it truly has bipartisan support.

H.R. 2291, the Drug-free Communities Support Program Reauthorization Act, address one of the most serious problems we have in America today, the scourge of drug use and drug abuse. Unfortunately, many of our efforts in the war against drugs have been very disappointing. Fortunately, however, this program is a notable exception. It focuses on two very important elements: first, it focuses on children, early intervention to prevent young people from getting involved in drugs, prevent young people from developing the drug habit. Second and critically and we have heard talk about this today, it focuses on local communities. Not all the knowledge resides here in Washington. And it is very important that we allow local communities, coalitions to come together to provide solutions that make sense in their neighborhoods.

At the heart of this program are grants to broad-based local coalition groups composed of representatives of children, parents, businesses, the media, law enforcement, religious and other civic groups, health care professionals and others all working together to combat drug abuse in their communities.

In my own district, an organization called the Community Services Coalition receives Federal funds which they match to serve these useful purposes. According to the project director, the program has identified some of the risk factors that lead to drug abuse and drug use. It has been a benefit not just to the individuals who are affected but also to their families and to the larger community. The grant helps identify successful programs and also helps identify gaps in services because sometimes our intentions do not meet our efforts. We also need to identify areas which require further monitoring.

Madam Speaker, I think this program is an excellent program. I am very pleased to support it on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a cosponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, this program is rooted in real local experience. About 5 years ago the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and I were preparing notes. We told each other how successful our efforts were in our local communities. In.

My case, one community in particular, where there had been a coalition which had brought together a very diverse group of people from law enforcement, from schools, elected officials, from the religious community, businessmen, parents and students, we asked ourselves in this battle against substance abuse if these were examples of success in Cincinnati and in my case in Troy, Michigan, how could we spread this success throughout the country. So it was the local experience that was the germination of this idea and which led with the help of so many others to the 1997 law.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) for working with us in taking this program farther down the road because now, instead of a few coalitions, there are over 300, well over 300, which have been supported with seed money, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) indicated.

This is not an effort to give people or coalitions or groups money and then they use that money; they have to use their own resources, their own talents, their own imagination. This is seed money.

So now, while 10 years ago there was one coalition in the district I represent, now there are seven, plus two umbrella organizations. We have learned from this experience, and the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Maryland and the gen-

tleman from Ohio have enumerated that.

We have expanded the authorization levels and we have encouraged self-sufficiency by making sure if there is a further grant, there is additional match. We have also made sure that there is a mentoring program here so that successful entities can parent those that are in their infancy.

Madam Speaker, as mentioned, we have added a new idea, a training and technical assistance institute. I also want to congratulate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) or say a word about that because it is so important that this effort spread in those communities, often so much in need where there is not perhaps the immediate access to resources, receive the support that is necessary. So the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is an important amendment.

Let me just close by saying, we all know there is no magic wand to this effort against drug abuse. We all know there is no single answer. We all know that we have to strive to find the answers. We owe it to our children, to our grandchildren, to our friends, to people of all ages at all places, in all circumstances. This is an effort to say to the country, this Congress is serious.

We extend a hand. We extend some resources. Ultimately the job is up to the community. So far so good; and we hope with the help of this program there will be more good efforts in this country to tackle this continuing serious problem, drug abuse.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who has been at the forefront of this fight.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman for his excellent bipartisan work with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) on this important bill which sailed through the Committee on Government Reform, on its merits, for good reason.

Madam Speaker, I am indebted to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for taking a good idea and nationalizing it. This bill deals with alcohol abuse, drug abuse, tobacco abuse, and researchers know, perhaps it is in the biology of young people, to get a person hooked, get them hooked when they are young. So it is impossible to overemphasize the importance of reaching people early.

This is an extraordinary bill for the way it leverages almost nothing. It essentially goes into communities and says, here is a little bit of money, let the community do it. What we are doing here with these grants is to say that communities can do far more cheaply and devotedly what it takes a lot more professionals to do if we do not get in there early.

I want to mention a grant that we have in the District of Columbia. We

have only one; it is a \$100,000 grant. The grants are very competitive. The grant in the District of Columbia is an example of what the faith-based community can do. We have an enormously controversial faith-based bill here, full of constitutional traps, discriminatory patterns.

But look at what the D.C. Community Prevention Partnership is doing with none of that controversy. It increases awareness of faith-based institutions and effective prevention principles.

So take the churches and the faith-based organizations and teach them about the principles, and the churches will do the rest. It also links community-based youth-serving organizations with neighborhood faith-based institutions. Again, none of the controversy, but leveraging faith-based institutions.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Members on their authorship of this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who sits on the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, and was very instrumental in making sure that this legislation was appropriately amended.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2291, the Drug-Free Communities Support Program reauthorization. I also commend the sponsors, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN). I also commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) for their cooperation in moving this legislation to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I also acknowledge and thank the recently appointed drug czar, former Representative Hutchinson, for visiting with me to discuss these issues back at home in Illinois.

I am pleased to support the reauthorization of this vital program because it goes a long way towards reducing drug use in our communities.

All of us are aware of the tremendous drug use problems. We are aware of the fact that even young people today are beginning to use habit-forming drugs at an early age. When we talk about getting a bang for the buck or getting the most for the dollars that we spend, what we are really doing is taking a little bit of money, no more than \$100,000, but we are empowering large numbers of people to become engaged, to become involved, to interact with each other, to discuss issues, to find ways to combat a problem.

Madam Speaker, I suggest this is one of the most effective utilizations of small amounts of money that we could ever have. I thank the Committee on Government Reform for accepting my amendment. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their tremendous leadership in moving this legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, in closing, not long after we held a hearing on this legislation, Judge Michael Kramer of Noble County, Indiana, sent me a note. He testified at our hearing. He talked about how he had to step out of the role as a judge and do things in the community, to do some prevention-type things because he had seen so much pain come before him. One of the things that he said in his note was he said, we have been doing a pretty good job, and he happens to be from the district of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), and we want to share what we are doing with people in Baltimore and other areas.

Going back to what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) talked about, the whole idea of people working together to address this problem, here was a wonderful judge in, I am sure, a rural area of our country extending his hand to help us out in the City of Baltimore. The fact is that this is what this is all about: trying to give people an opportunity to affect their lives, to be empowered in their own community and take control of situations.

Madam Speaker, as I listened to the many witnesses that came before us, it was clear that there are so many people that want to do something, and they have two problems: One, they need a limited amount of resources; two, a lot of times they need somebody to help them, to show them how to do what they have to do. This legislation addresses both of those issues very effectively.

As I said in the Committee on Government Reform, and I will say it no matter where I go, out of the many things that I have been a part of in this Congress, this is one of the most important things. One of the things that this legislation does, Madam Speaker, is clearly it saves a lot of lives and it saves a lot of pain. So I am very, very pleased to urge this House to support this legislation unanimously.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the ranking member for all of their support for getting this legislation to the floor. I urge that we adopt this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this is a worldwide battle. It is not a battle just in the United States. Yesterday five Colombian national police were painfully gassed in police headquarters in large part because of a war caused in Colombia because of American drug consumption.

Last week some Members were in Venezuela at the Andean parliament session to discuss antinarcotics efforts in the Andean nations where most of our cocaine and heroin comes from. As they look at creative ways to reduce

the amount of poppy and coca that is grown, as they look for ways to reduce the consumption in their area, what we do in America has a direct impact on South America and Central America.

Madam Speaker, we went up to Pucallpa and we saw in the Amazonian jungle fires coming up throughout this national park as peasants stripped the woods along the Amazon basin in order to plant more coca for American consumption.

While Plan Colombia is important and the Andean Initiative is important, and law enforcement efforts are important and interdiction efforts are important, the fact is, unless we concentrate more aggressively on prevention and treatment in America where the demand begins, we cannot make any other program work. The demand is beginning here, and this bill is the anchor of our Federal prevention efforts in America. This is a desperate battle we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2291, the Reauthorization of the Drug Free Communities Act (DFCA). I want to commend my colleague, Representative PORTMAN, for introducing this important legislation.

This program is a major component of our national demand reduction strategy. Over the last five years, through its program of distributing grants to community organizations, the DFCA has demonstrated itself to be a resounding success.

This success is due in part to the nature of the grant recipients, various anti-drug coalitions. These coalitions are community groups containing representatives of youth, parents, private industry, media and press, law enforcement, health care professionals and religious and civic leaders working together to provide a cohesive, effective anti-drug message and strategy.

H.R. 2219 reauthorizes the (DFCA) for an additional five years, and increases its overall funding levels by \$10 million each year. Prior awardees would be able to apply for new grants, in addition to being eligible for "mentoring grants" in order to assist new coalitions with their initial start-up efforts.

Madam Speaker, the threat posed by illegal drugs is one of the largest national security threats facing our nation.

In addition to costs associated with supply and demand reduction, drug use costs our nation billions each year in health care expenses and lost productivity. Moreover, it also has intangible costs in terms of broken families and destroyed lives.

Our children are on the front lines as victims of the drug war. They are the primary target of both the drug producers and the sellers. The (DFCA) has a proven track record of success in reducing demand for drugs among our younger population. Given that today's adolescents are potentially the addicts of tomorrow, I wholeheartedly support extending and expanding a Federal program that has demonstrated past success in our war on drugs.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give this bipartisan bill their wholehearted support.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, substance abuse is one of our Nation's most pervasive problems. It is a disease that does not discriminate on the basis of age, gender, socio-

economic status, race or creed. And while we tend to stereotype drug abuse as an urban problem, the steadily growing number of heroin and methamphetamine addicts in rural villages and suburban towns shows that is simply not the case.

We have nearly 15 million drug users in this country, 4 million of whom are hard-core addicts. We all know someone—a family member, neighbor, colleague or friend—who has become addicted to drugs or alcohol although we may be unaware. And we are all affected by the undeniable correlation between substance abuse and crime—an overwhelming 80 percent of the 2 million men and women behind bars today have a history of drug and alcohol abuse or addiction or were arrested for a drug-related crime.

All of this comes at a hefty price. Drug abuse and addiction cost this Nation \$110 billion in law enforcement and other criminal justice expenses, medical bills, lost earnings and other costs each year. Illegal drugs are responsible for thousands of deaths each year and for the spread of a number of communicable diseases, including AIDS and Hepatitis C. And a study by the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA) shows that 7 out of 10 cases of child abuse and neglect are caused or exacerbated by substance abuse and addiction.

Another CASA study recently revealed that for each dollar that States spend on substance-abuse related programs, 96 cents goes to dealing with the consequences of substance abuse and only 4 cents to preventing and treating it. Investing more in prevention and treatment is cost-effective because it will decrease much of the street crime, child abuse, domestic violence, and other social ills that can result from substance abuse.

If we can get kids through age 21 without smoking, abusing alcohol, or using drugs, they are unlikely to have a substance abuse problem in the future. But there are still those who shrug their shoulders and say "kids are kids—they are going to experiment." Others find the thought of keeping kids drug-free too daunting a task, and they give up too soon.

But the truth is that we are learning more and more about drug prevention as researchers isolate the so-called "risk" and "protective" factors for drug use. In other words, we now know that if a child has low self-esteem or emotional problems; has a substance abuser for a parent; is a victim of child abuse; or is exposed to pro-drug media messages, that child is at a higher risk of smoking, drinking and using illegal drugs. But the good news is that we are also learning what decreases a child's risk of substance abuse.

The Drug Free Communities program allows coalitions to put prevention research into action in cities and towns nationwide by funding initiatives tailored to a community's individual needs. It currently funds more than 300 community coalitions across the country that work to reduce drug, alcohol, and tobacco use.

And they are making a difference, which is just one of the reasons that I am proud to support this important bill reauthorizing the program.

Drug abuse plagues the entire community. We all feel the consequences—crime, homelessness, domestic violence, child abuse, despair—and we all need to do something about it. Prevention messages must come from all sectors of the community, from a number of

different voices. Coalitions bring those groups together, give them information they need, help develop programs that work, and nurture them to success.

I believe that the Drug Free Communities program is a powerful prevention initiative and I urge my colleagues to support its reauthorization.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2291, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF SUMMER EMERGENCY BLOOD DONOR MONTH

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res 202) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the establishment of a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Month to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 202

Whereas every 3 seconds someone in the United States needs a blood transfusion;

Whereas approximately 32,000 pints of blood are used each day in the United States;

Whereas donated blood is used for transfusions of platelets, red blood cells, and plasma;

Whereas between 5 and 8 pints of red blood cells and approximately 5 pints of platelets are needed for the average open-heart surgery;

Whereas people who have been in car accidents and suffered massive blood loss may require transfusions of 50 pints or more of red blood cells;

Whereas blood centers are often in short supply of type O and type B blood;

Whereas shortages of type O and type B blood are most acute during the summer and during traditional vacation periods during the winter;

Whereas blood shortages can result in canceled surgeries, emergency room closures, and even death;

Whereas the Southeastern United States was in short supply of blood for transfusions before being hit by tropical storm Allison and is now experiencing a blood shortage crisis;

Whereas other States are donating blood from their own fragile blood supplies to the States that were hit hardest by tropical storm Allison;

Whereas the State of New York is experiencing a blood shortage crisis;

Whereas eligible donors in the State of New York are less than half as likely as other eligible donors in the United States to donate blood;

Whereas due to higher rates of cancer and other factors, the demand for blood in New York is higher than in other States;

Whereas the State of New York and the entire United States would benefit from increased blood donation;

Whereas the establishment of a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season would encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood; and

Whereas the summer of 2001 would be an appropriate season to establish as Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season should be established to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood; and

(2) the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the summer of 2001 with appropriate programs and activities, including, in the case of eligible donors, the donation of blood.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 202 expresses the sense of Congress that the President should establish a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Month to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood. Although we just celebrated Labor Day, which is the traditional end of summer, the health care system continues to experience a shortage of blood donors. This resolution expresses the support of Congress to encourage blood donors to help their families and neighbors in times of need and will hopefully serve to increase public awareness of this issue.

I thank the principal sponsors of this resolution, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), for their work on this resolution, which I support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Since 1970, the President of the United States has proclaimed January as National Volunteer Blood Donor Month, highlighting the importance of giving the gift of life through the donation of blood. House Resolution 202 will continue to help raise the public's awareness about blood donation by establishing a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Month.

Every 3 seconds, someone needs blood. Each day, patients across the country receive approximately 32,000 units of this vital resource. This year alone, as many as 4 million patients will require blood transfusions, as accident victims, people undergoing surgery and patients receiving treatment for leukemia, cancer and other diseases. By donating blood just once, each of us can save up to three lives. Too many Americans wait until they need blood before they truly realize the importance of volunteer blood donation. Sixty percent of the U.S. population is eligible to donate blood, but only 5 percent do so. While women and minority groups are volunteering to donate blood in increasing numbers, the 5 percent who donate blood are generally college-educated white males between the ages of 30 and 50 who are married and have an above-average income.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) should be commended for raising all Americans' awareness about the importance of donating blood and giving the gift of life. Blood donations are most needed during holidays and in the summer. It is during the holidays and summer that the number of donations decline while the demand continues or even increases. This resolution will go a long way in addressing the Nation's need for blood during this critical period.

I have always been told, Madam Speaker, that you cannot lead where you do not go and you cannot teach what you do not know. So I am pleased to note that each year at some point in time I find some way to go to a blood donor organization, get on the couch, get on the table, have my blood pressure taken and give blood, even if I have got some reservation or hesitation.

Again I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and urge all Members of this body to enthusiastically support this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the principal cosponsor.

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding time. I rise in strong support of House Resolution 202.

At the outset, let me thank the gentleman from Indiana for bringing this bill to the floor and moving it along. I also want to pay a special debt of thanks to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for the effort and the leadership she has shown in this issue as she has on so many other health-related issues.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois really laid out the case. The reality is that every 3 seconds somebody needs a transfusion. Thirty-two thousand pints of blood are needed every

day. Yet as the demand goes up, the supply is going down. It is essential that the Federal Government play a leadership role. One way to do that, one very noted way of doing that is to set aside a month during the summer season, to set aside the summer season as the time when donation will be urged, encouraged. This is the time when the demand is at its greatest.

That is why I am again proud to stand in support of House Resolution 202. It deserves the unanimous support of this body. I thank the gentleman from Indiana, as I said. I thank the gentlewoman from Long Island, New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for the leadership she has shown on this issue.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), the author of this legislation and one of the more sensitive Members of this body in relationship to human needs.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) of the Committee on Government Reform for allowing this resolution to come to the floor so rapidly. I want to certainly thank my good friend from Long Island, New York (Mr. KING) for helping me on this issue. I want to associate myself with the kind words that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned.

We talk about giving blood. I know as a nurse over so many years, people are afraid to give blood. There is nothing to be afraid of. If you do not like needles, just turn your eye. You can give it in 15 minutes. But taking that 15 minutes out of your life has an opportunity to save so many lives. We always think about giving blood in times of our community when there are accidents or a tragedy happens and people do go to the hospitals to give blood. This is happening every single day. No one talks about the children across this Nation that have leukemia and they have to have transfusions. No one talks about how much blood is needed for our patients that have hemophilic blood problems. No one talks about cancer, how it affects women and how they need their transfusion so they can go through their chemotherapy.

I am hoping that by us being here on the floor and talking about it, those in the Nation who are watching this will say to themselves, "You know, I can make a difference." I think that is what we are trying to ask. This resolution certainly is for the summer but it is blood every single day that we need throughout the year.

The other thing that unfortunately is happening, we see especially in New York that only 2 percent of the people of New York give blood. This is happening across our larger cities. We do not talk about those in the minority communities that come down with sickle-cell anemia and how they need blood transfusions. We have to start

educating people more and more on why they should give blood. You can give blood almost every 53 days. It is certainly a habit that I am into.

I want to remind all my colleagues that the end of this month we will be having another blood drive here in the Capitol. I am hoping that all my colleagues will donate this time so we can set an example certainly for all of our constituents back home. Also I would like to see all our colleagues go home and do a blood drive. One of our jobs is to teach our constituents on what we do. So I think it is extremely important.

Unfortunately, one of the other problems that we are seeing is because we are seeing less and less blood coming over from Europe, people do not realize how much blood we count on, especially in our major cities for the transfusions that we get from overseas. That is going to be cut off at the end of this month and unless we can certainly sustain that, our cities are going to be in more of a crisis than ever before.

So I certainly urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution but more than support it, do something about it. The easiest thing that we can do for the American people is to give blood. I happen to think that people in this country are tremendous during emergencies. Well, we are in an emergency. A pint of blood can save three lives or even more. I urge that this resolution be passed. I thank again the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING). I thank the committee for passing this so fast.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to again thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) for bringing this to the floor in an expeditious way and also the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) for their leadership and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for his statement. It reminds us again and we are going officially on record that we need to think beyond ourselves and think of others and pay tribute to the millions of Americans who already donate blood and encourage that at this time of need.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana. It is always a pleasure to work with him and to interact with him. I will close by simply stating that when we give blood, we give the gift of life. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for stimulating me and for challenging all of us. I am going to take up her challenge and I am going to go back to my district and organize a blood donor drive before the end of this year.

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to join my colleagues in supporting H. Res. 202, a resolution expressing the sense of the House regarding the establishment of a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood.

Currently, our blood supply sometimes struggles to meet the demand for blood, which is increasing due to an aging population, increase in cancer diagnoses and new medical and surgical advancements. The recent decision by the Food and Drug Administration to eliminate donations from Europe will exacerbate this situation in New York City. Our teaching hospitals offer the finest surgical care in the world but these procedures often require substantial amounts of blood to stabilize a patient. That is why I am co-hosting a blood drive with, the Brooklyn/Staten Island Blood Services, the newest operating region of the New York Blood Center this coming Saturday at the East New York Diagnostic and Treatment Center.

This drive is specifically designed to encourage minority participation in the City's blood drive. Less than 8% of the Blood Center's volunteer blood donors are African-American. This population represents only 7% of the community's blood supply. Yet, African-Americans make up nearly 30% of New York City's population. Blood is particularly needed from minorities because minority patients sometimes have rare and unique markers, known as antigens, in their blood inherited from their race and ethnicity and may require a life-saving transfusion from someone of the same background. This Saturday's event at the East NY Diagnostic and Treatment Center will help boost the already significant collection progress in Brooklyn where the donor base has been increased by one-third in the past year.

Having participated in Government Reform oversight hearings on the nation's blood supply, I understand first-hand how critical it is to encourage Americans to continually replenish the nation's blood centers with blood donations. I want to commend the authors of this legislation and the House leadership for scheduling this resolution at such a critical time. Hopefully, it will greatly increase the public's education and awareness about the need for blood donations. I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 202.

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, as Americans, one of the many things that we can be thankful for is the high quality of medical care. American technology, physicians, and pharmaceutical companies are often leaders in the development of new and improved healthcare equipment and techniques. But even the most cutting-edge technologies, the best doctors and nurses, and the finest facilities cannot save the life of a person in need of a blood transfusion. A child with cancer, a mother who was in a car accident, or a grandfather who needs an emergency operation—any of these individuals could be saved by a simple gift of blood. Without this vital gift, which I must add is in great demand, many of our patients would not survive.

Yet consider the following: Only five percent of people who are able to donate blood do so on a regular basis.

And, although donated blood can be stored for up to six weeks, it usually is used within ten days because the demand is so great.

Every one of us knows someone—a family member, a friend, a loved one—who has needed, and received a blood transfusion at some point. But there are so many more who are in danger of not receiving the help they need.

This is why it is so vital that we make people aware of the importance of donating blood. I take this responsibility very seriously and give blood on a regular basis. Yet, I am only one person. We need to find ways to encourage more. Today, we can pass a resolution, which expresses the sense of the House that we establish a summer emergency blood donor season to encourage eligible donors.

I strongly support this resolution. We must ensure that everyone who is able to give blood does so. It is perhaps the most important gift we can give.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 202, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the establishment of a Summer Emergency Blood Donor Season to encourage eligible donors in the United States to donate blood."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2510) to extend the expiration date of the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2510

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 2001".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended by striking "September 30, 2001" and inserting "September 30, 2004".

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 711(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161(b)) is amended by striking "1996 through 2001" and inserting "2002 through 2004".

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended as follows:

(1) In section 301(a)(1) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(a)(1)), by striking "714(a)(1) of this Act" and inserting "702(16)".

(2) In subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 301(e)(1) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(1)), by striking "industrial resource shortfall" each place such term appears and inserting "industrial resource or critical technology item shortfall".

(3) In sections 301(e)(1)(D)(ii) and 303(a)(7)(B) (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(1)(D)(ii), 2093(a)(7)(B)), by inserting "item" after "critical technology".

(4) In section 304(b)(1), (50 U.S.C. App. 2094(b)(1)), by striking "711(c)" and inserting "711(b)".

(5) In sections 301(e)(2)(B) and 309(a)(1), (50 U.S.C. App. 2091(e)(2)(B), 2099(a)(1)), by striking "Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs of the House of Representatives" and inserting "Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2510, the Defense Production Act Amendments of 2001. As I am sure my colleagues know, the DPA is an essential element of our national security package. The DPA uses economic tools to provide uninterrupted supplies of industrial resources in times of both military crisis and civil emergency.

We are here today because the President's authority under the DPA expires at the end of the fiscal year. This bill introduced by the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) who chairs the Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy and his ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), is a straightforward, 3-year reauthorization with a handful of purely technical amendments.

Those amendments amount to little more than housekeeping. For example, one of those changes updates the statute to reflect the creation of the Committee on Financial Services at the beginning of this Congress. Others fix errors in section numbering or harmonize language within the statute.

Madam Speaker, I have with me the administration's statement in support of this bill along with a letter from Defense Principal Deputy Undersecretary Michael W. Wynne endorsing this legislation.

□ 1515

Madam Speaker, I will include these for the RECORD at this point.

PRINCIPAL DEPUTY
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 4, 2001.

Hon. MICHAEL OXLEY,
Chairman, House Financial Services Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is to express my strong supporter of the enactment of H.R. 2510, 107th Congress, an Act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950. The legislation gives the Department the ability to use the authorities of the Act for items and industrial resources that are essential for national security needs. The District Production Act authorities remain important elements in our national defense program.

H.R. 2510 extends and reauthorizes the Defense Production Act by three years from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2004.

This legislation provides a number of critical authorities needed to ensure a strong industrial base capable of meeting national defense requirements in peacetime as well as in times of national emergency. Title I of the DPA provides for priority performance on contracts and orders to meet approved national defense and emergency preparedness program requirements. Title I is indispensable in expediting production to meet the critical needs of US forces engaged in military operations. Title I authorities were used to ensure priority production and shipment of numerous items urgently needed by the coalition forces during Desert Shield/Storm and more recently Bosnia and Kosovo.

The Title III authorities enable us to establish assured and affordable production capacity for items essential for national defense. Title III is an extremely valuable tool that enables the Department to field technologically superior systems, upgrade the capabilities of older systems, and reduce operations and sustainment costs. A recent Title III project for Discontinuous Reinforced Aluminum (DRA) resulted in the insertion of components made of DRA in the F-16 fighter that are dramatically reducing life-cycle costs and improved flight safety.

This legislation does not call for additional spending by the Government or Department of Defense. A similar letter has been sent to the Ranking Member, Congressman John LaFalce.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL W. WYNNE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, September 5, 2001.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 2510—DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2001 (REP. KING (R) NEW YORK AND REP. MALONEY (D) NEW YORK)

The Administration supports H.R. 2510, which would extend the expiration date and authorization of appropriations for the Defense Production Act through FY 2004.

The expiration of the Defense Production Act could have a severe impact on the Nation's ability to respond to national security threats, both at home and abroad. Thus, passage of H.R. 2510 would ensure the President's continued ability to provide for the Nation's security by providing authority to: (1) establish, expand, or maintain essential domestic industrial capacity; (2) direct priority performance of contracts and orders to meet approved national security requirements; and (3) suspend or prohibit a foreign acquisition of a U.S. firm when that acquisition would present a threat to the Nation's security.

Madam Speaker, over the past 3 years, the DPA has been reauthorized

on a year-to-year basis due to accidents in the legislative calendar. This authority is far too important to allow uncertainty over the future of the DPA to continue. We do not want to repeat the mistakes of 1990, when the DPA expired in the middle of the buildup of Operation Desert Storm.

While the DPA may need to be tweaked in the future, we should ensure that those important authorities continue uninterrupted and use the next 3 years to carefully examine proposed improvements to the act.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) deserve great credit for their bipartisan work on this bill. I urge all Members to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the 3-year reauthorization of the Defense Production Act of 1950. This is bipartisan legislation that was reported by the Committee on Financial Services by voice vote.

First enacted during the Korean War, the DPA has proven a useful tool in ensuring the delivery of goods and services needed for the defense of the Nation during times of war and peace. The act was used in Operation Desert Storm to assist in the massive deployment of forces to the Gulf.

Most recently it was used by the Clinton and Bush administrations to maintain the supply of natural gas to California. Without this action, the administration contended that defense installations in northern and central California could have faced interrupted natural gas service.

The DPA has played an important role in dealing with recent natural disasters. Should the country face a major domestic terrorist attack, the DPA could be valuable in ensuring that emergency supplies are delivered to those who need them and in a timely manner.

As the representative of a city that has been the target of terrorist attacks and many terrorist threats, I can attest that, unfortunately, such a potential use of the DPA is not a mere rhetorical possibility.

Given the DPA's relevance to natural disasters, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, FEMA, has taken the lead in reviewing the act and requesting its reauthorization, which is set to expire October 12 of this year.

The Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, Technology and Economic Growth held a hearing on June 13 of this year, a meeting at which Members were able to raise concerns and have them answered by FEMA and other agencies. It is after careful review of the act and following this hearing that I chose to cosponsor the reauthorization.

Finally, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY), the gentleman from New York (Chairman KING), and

the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), for moving quickly on this legislation. In the past, Congress has often rushed to renew the DPA under the gun of its pending expiration. I appreciate the fact that we have followed committee process, culminating with today's vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), the coauthor of this legislation.

Mr. KING. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2510 and to associate myself with the remarks of the full committee chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman OXLEY). I also want to thank the chairman for allowing this important reauthorization bill to move quickly through the committee as we push up against its expiration date. I also want to thank my subcommittee ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for her bipartisan cosponsorship of this bill. Madam Speaker, this bill has enjoyed broad support, allowing us to proceed in a genuinely bipartisan manner.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and I introduced this DPA reauthorization bill after receiving testimony on June 13 of this year from the Departments of Defense, Commerce, Energy and FEMA, the agency responsible for the act's coordinating efforts. By request of the administration, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and I have worked together to put forth a clean 3-year reauthorization bill, recognizing the importance that this act holds for the ability of any administration to address defense and civil preparedness issues. As reflected in the committee testimony and debate, a multiyear extension makes the most sense.

As the chairman stated, and I want to emphasize this, the changes that are contemplated in DPA are extremely technical in nature. Also, in closing, let me say that I realize that if used inappropriately, DPA has the potential to adversely affect our domestic marketplace. Fortunately, throughout the almost 50 years that it has been in existence, there has been no such adverse impact.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking members, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); and I look forward to the swift non-controversial adoption of this measure.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, although our effort in the House of Representatives today to extend the Defense Production Act is commendable, the House has missed a prime opportunity to make this Act more effective in ensuring our national security and helping American workers.

The Defense Production Act, first enacted in 1950, ensures that products, materials, and

services essential to our national security are available to defense related agencies at all times—but especially in times of conflict. One material that is especially critical to our defense needs is steel. Our armed forces would not be able to respond to a national emergency without an adequate supply of domestically produced steel.

But at this very moment, the American steel industry is in dire straits. In recent months a number of steel companies have been driven into bankruptcy, and others are on the brink. Thousands of jobs are at risk, as another wave of low-cost steel imports has battered the domestic industry. In my home district, LTV Steel, which employs thousands of Cleveland residents, is undergoing bankruptcy proceedings and has had to idle one of its plants.

A bill I introduced, the Steel and National Security Act, would have amended the Defense Production Act to enable the President to step in and aid critical defense industries such as steel. In its findings, the Steel and National Security Act identifies domestic steel capacity as an essential part of what a key executive order has called the "foundation for national defense preparedness": our domestic industrial and technological base.

To revive and secure the health of the American steel industry and thereby ensure adequate domestic capacity, the Steel and National Security Act would reauthorize the Defense Production Act's Title III, with a specific allocation of \$1 billion in each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004 for Department of Defense loans, grants and purchase commitments. Fifty percent of each year's allocated funds would be reserved for purchase commitments, to ensure that ailing industries are given a sharp boost.

The bill would also establish a National Defense Preparedness Domestic Industrial Base Board. The Board would be responsible, through one time en masse purchases and other means, for ensuring uninterrupted availability of defense-related materials. Together, these provisions would ensure enough demand so that domestic industries critical to our national security—like steel—can survive tough times.

But that is not all my bill would accomplish. The Steel and National Security Act would also reauthorize Defense Production Act's Title VII, with a specific directive ordering the Department of Defense to request a 45-day period of further investigation for all mergers, acquisitions, and takeovers involving a foreign steel company. This would ensure that domestic capacity to produce materials and goods essential to our national security always exists.

Mr. Speaker, though the House has acted correctly in extending the Defense Production Act to 2004, it has not acted decisively to aid those industries most vital to our national security.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2510.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF TREATY TRADERS AND TREATY INVESTORS

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2277) to provide for work authorization for nonimmigrant spouses of treaty traders and treaty investors.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2277

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR SPOUSES OF TREATY TRADERS AND TREATY INVESTORS.

Section 214(e) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) In the case of an alien spouse admitted under section 101(a)(15)(E), who is accompanying or following to join a principal alien admitted under such section, the Attorney General shall authorize the alien spouse to engage in employment in the United States and provide the spouse with an ‘employment authorized’ endorsement or other appropriate work permit.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2277.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, today the House is likely to approve, for the fourth and fifth time this year, pro-family, pro-immigrant legislation that we have crafted in the Committee on the Judiciary. This body can be proud of the work it has done upholding the Nation's tradition of welcoming immigrants to our shores in a responsible manner.

This particular bill, H.R. 2277, would allow spouses of E visa recipients to work in the United States while accompanying the primary visa recipients.

E visas are available for treaty traders and investors. A visa is available to an alien who “is entitled to enter the United States under and in pursuance of the provisions of a treaty of com-

merce and navigation between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national . . . solely to carry on substantial trade, including trade in services or trade in technology, principally between the United States and the foreign state of which he is a national, or . . . solely to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which he has invested . . . a substantial amount of capital.”

Alien employees of a treaty trader or treaty investor may receive E visas if they are coming to the U.S. to engage in duties of an executive or supervisory character, or, if employed in the lesser capacity, if they have special qualifications that make the services to be rendered essential to the efficient operation of the enterprise. The alien employee would need to be of the same nationality as the treaty trader or investor.

For fiscal year 1998, 9,457 aliens, including dependents, were granted E visas as treaty traders; and 20,775 aliens, including dependents, were granted E visas as treaty investors.

While current law allows spouses and minor children to come to the U.S. with the E visa recipients, spouses are not allowed to work in the United States. Since working spouses are now becoming the rule rather than the exception in our society and in many foreign countries, multinational corporations are finding it increasingly difficult to persuade their employees abroad to relocate to the United States.

Spouses, often wives, hesitate to forego their own career ambitions or a second income to accommodate an overseas assignment. This factor places an impediment in the way of the use by employees from treaty countries of the E visa program and their contributing to trade with and invest in the United States.

There is no good reason why we should put an impediment in the way of the business's effort to attract talented people. There is no good reason why husbands and wives should have to ask their spouses to forego employment as a condition of joining them in America.

Thus H.R. 2277 would simply allow the spouses of E visa recipients to work in the United States while accompanying the primary visa recipient. Families will no longer have to choose between the advancement of either spouse's career in order to grasp an opportunity to come to America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2277. While current law allows spouses to come to the United States with E visa holders, spouses are not allowed to work in the United States. H.R. 2277 would allow these spouses

work authorization in the United States while accompanying the E visa holder.

It does not make any sense whatsoever to allow spouses to accompany their partners to the United States and then deny them the opportunity to be employed. Furthermore, this bill makes the time these families live in the United States financially easier since it allows for a second income.

Madam Speaker, I hope that this bill is the beginning of an understanding that we should allow spouses in other nonimmigrant classifications who accompany their husband or wife to the United States to be able to obtain work authorization.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2277.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT SPOUSES OF INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2278) to provide work authorization for nonimmigrant spouses of intracompany transferees, and to reduce the period of time during which certain intracompany transferees have to be continuously employed before applying for admission to the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2278

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. WORK AUTHORIZATION FOR SPOUSES OF INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES.

Section 214(c)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(E) In the case of an alien spouse admitted under section 101(a)(15)(L), who is accompanying or following to join a principal alien admitted under such section, the Attorney General shall authorize the alien spouse to engage in employment in the United States and provide the spouse with an ‘employment authorized’ endorsement or other appropriate work permit.”.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF REQUIRED PERIOD OF PRIOR CONTINUOUS EMPLOYMENT FOR CERTAIN INTRACOMPANY TRANSFEREES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(c)(2)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(c)(2)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“In the case of an alien seeking admission under section 101(a)(15)(L), the one-year period of continuous employment required

under such section is deemed to be reduced to a 6-month period if the importing employer has filed a blanket petition under this subparagraph and met the requirements for expedited processing of aliens covered under such petition."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 101(a)(15)(L) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(L)) is amended by striking "an alien who," and inserting "subject to section 214(c)(2), an alien who,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2278.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a companion bill to H.R. 2277, just passed. Just as H.R. 2277 provides employment authorization to spouses of E visa recipients, this bill provides employment authorization to spouses of L visa recipients.

L visas are available for intracompany transferees. They allow employees working at a company's overseas branch to be shifted to the company's work site in the United States.

An L visa is available to an alien who "within 3 years preceding the time of his application for admission into the United States has been employed continuously for one year by a firm or an affiliate or subsidiary and who seeks to enter the United States temporarily in order to continue to render his services to the same employer in a capacity that is managerial, executive or involves specialized knowledge."

To make the L visa program more convenient for established and frequent users of the program, blanket L visas are available. If an employer meets certain qualifications, such as having received approval for at least 10 L visa professionals during the past year or having U.S. subsidiaries or affiliates with an annual combined sales of at least \$25 million or having a workforce of at least 1,000 employees, the employer can receive preapproval for an unlimited number of L visas from the Immigration Service.

□ 1530

Individual aliens seeking visas to work for the companies simply have to show that the job they will be employed in qualifies for the L visa program and that they are qualified to do the job.

In fiscal year 1998, 38,307 aliens, along with 44,176 dependents, were granted L visas.

While the current law allows spouses and minor children to come to the U.S. with the L visa recipients, spouses are not allowed to work in this country. As I stated in regard to H.R. 2277, working spouses are now becoming the rule rather than the exception in the U.S. and in many foreign countries, and multinational companies are finding it increasingly difficult to persuade their employees abroad to relocate to the United States if it means their spouses will have to forgo employment. This factor places an impediment in the way of these employers' use of the L visa program and their competitiveness in the international economy.

There is no good reason why we should put an impediment in the way of business and academia's efforts to attract talented people. There is also no good reason why husbands and wives should have to ask their spouses to forgo employment as a condition of joining them in America. Thus, H.R. 2278 would allow the spouses of L visa recipients to work in the United States while accompanying the primary visa recipients.

Additionally, the current law requires that the beneficiary of an L visa have been employed for at least 1 year overseas by the petitioning employer. In many situations, this is an overly restrictive requirement. For example, consulting agencies often recruit and hire individuals overseas with specialized skills to meet the needs of particular clients. The 1-year-prior-employment requirement can result in long delays before they can bring such employees into the United States on an L visa. A shorter prior employment period would allow companies to more expeditiously meet the needs of their clients.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2278 would allow aliens to qualify for L visas after having worked for 6 months overseas for employers if the employers have filed blanket L petitions and have met the blanket petition's requirements. There is a high level of fraud in the L visa program, especially involving "front companies" set up purely to procure visas; and lowering the across-the-board qualifications for the L visas might encourage more fraudulent petitions. With a company that has been prescreened and approved for the "blanket" L visa status, the risk of fraud is much lower.

Thus, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WEXLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2278. This is a positive bill because it allows work authorization for non-immigrant spouses of intracompany transferees.

Not only will spouses be able to accompany their husband or wife who is in the United States in a non-immigrant capacity, but these spouses

will now be afforded the opportunity to be employed. It makes no sense to allow spouses to accompany their loved ones to the United States and then deny them the opportunity to be employed.

Global companies are finding it increasingly difficult to relocate foreign nationals to the United States. This bill makes relocation easier since spouses will not have to forgo their career, ambitions or a second income, which is increasingly necessary.

This bill is also positive since it contains a 6-month reduction in the period of time during which certain intracompany transferees have to be continuously employed before applying for admission to the United States. Without this bill, companies who recruit and hire individuals overseas with specialized skills to meet the needs of their clients will be able to bring these employees more expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2278.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTIONS OF PATENTABILITY IN REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1866) to amend title 35, United States Code, to clarify the basis for granting requests for reexamination of patents, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1866

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DETERMINATION OF SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION OF PATENTABILITY IN REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS.

Sections 303(a) and 312(a) of title 35, United States Code, are each amended by adding at the end the following: "The existence of a substantial new question of patentability is not precluded by the fact that a patent or printed publication was previously cited by or to the Office or considered by the Office."

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to any determination of the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office that is made under section 303(a) or 312(a) of title 35, United States Code, on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and

the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1866, as amended, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, Congress established the patent reexamination system in 1980. The 1980 reexamination statute was enacted with the intent reexamination of patents by the Patent and Trademark Office would achieve three principal benefits, first, to settle validity disputes more quickly and less expensively than litigation; second, to allow courts to refer patent validity questions to an agency with expertise in both the patent law and technology; and third, to reinforce investor confidence in the certainty of patent rights by affording an opportunity to review patents of doubtful validity.

More than 20 years after the original enactment of the reexamination statute, the Committee on the Judiciary still endorses these goals and encourages third parties to pursue reexamination as an efficient way of settling patent disputes.

Reexamination worked well until recently when it was severely limited by a Federal Court of Appeals decision. H.R. 1866 is intended to overturn the 1997 *In re Portola Packaging* case by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal circuit. That decision severely impairs the patent reexamination process. Reexamination was intended to be an important quality check on defective patents. Unfortunately, this decision severely limits its use.

The *Portola* case is criticized for establishing an illogical and overly strict bar concerning the scope of reexamination requests. The bill permits a broader range of cases to be the subject of a request, as was the case for the first 16 years since the law was enacted. The bill that we consider today preserves the "substantial new question standard" that is an important safeguard to protect all inventors against frivolous action and against harassment, while allowing the process to continue as originally intended. It also preserves the discretion of the Patent and Trademark Office in evaluating these cases.

The bill has been amended since its introduction by the full committee. I wish to take a moment to explain this to my colleagues.

Since its introduction, we heard from the public members of the bar and critics of the *Portola* decision who have

recommended that we make an additional change to ensure the result that we seek. The text is clarified to permit the use of relevant evidence that was "considered" by the PTO, but not necessarily "cited." Some would say this is redundant, but I prefer to clarify precisely when reexamination is an available procedure. This will ensure that the system is flexible and efficient. While many believe the base text is satisfactory to meet that goal, I hope that the amendment removes any doubt.

I believe that adding this one sentence to the Patent Act will help prevent the misuse of defective patents in all fields, especially those concerning business methods. An efficient patent system is important for inventors, investors and consumers. I urge Members to support H.R. 1866.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1866, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

The Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported this legislation by voice vote on June 20. Prior to that, the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property passed the bill by a voice vote on May 22. It is a good step forward on the road of making reexamination a more attractive and effective option for challenging a patent's validity.

The bill overturns, as the gentleman from Wisconsin mentioned, the 1997 Federal circuit decision *In re Portola Packaging*. In that case, the Federal circuit narrowly construed the term "substantial new question of patentability" to mean prior art that was not before the examiner during an earlier examination. Because the PTO director can only order a reexamination if a "substantial new question of patentability" exists, the Federal court's decision in *Portola* effectively bars the PTO from conducting a reexamination based on prior art that was cited in the patent application.

The *Portola* decision is troublesome because it prevents reexaminations from correcting mistakes made by examiners. Ideally, a reexamination could be requested based on prior art cited by an applicant that the examiner failed to adequately consider. However, after *Portola*, such prior art could not be the basis of the reexamination.

By overturning the *Portola* decision, H.R. 1866 will allow reexamination to correct some examiner errors. Thus, this bill will accomplish an important, if narrow, objective.

Madam Speaker, as far as I know, H.R. 1866 has not engendered any controversy, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gen-

tleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I will be very brief, because the gentleman from Wisconsin has thoroughly stated the matter, as has the gentleman from California.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has indicated, H.R. 1866, Madam Speaker, consists of adding a single sentence to the law in order to improve the patent reexamination system. It is based upon testimony that was offered before our subcommittee earlier this year. With this single sentence, we stab at the heart of defective business method and other inappropriately issued patents. At the same time, we protect small businesses and small inventors from harassing conduct in these proceedings.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), my friend and the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his work, as well, on this bill, and for that matter, all of the members of the subcommittee.

In closing, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the full committee, for having expeditiously moved this legislation along, because it is important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1866.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1866, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR APPEALS BY THIRD PARTIES IN CERTAIN PATENT REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1886) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for appeals by third parties in certain patent reexamination proceedings.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1886

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPEALS IN INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION PROCEEDINGS.

(a) APPEALS BY THIRD-PARTY REQUESTER IN PROCEEDINGS.—Section 315(b) of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) THIRD-PARTY REQUESTER.—A third-party requester—

"(1) may appeal under the provisions of section 134, and may appeal under the provisions of sections 141 through 144, with respect to any final decision favorable to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent; and

"(2) may, subject to subsection (c), be a party to any appeal taken by the patent owner under the provisions of section 134 or sections 141 through 144."

(b) APPEAL TO BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.—Section 134(c) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the last sentence.

(c) APPEAL TO COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.—Section 141 of title 35, United States Code, is amended in the third sentence by inserting ", or a third-party requester in an inter partes reexamination proceeding, who is" after "patent owner".

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act apply with respect to any reexamination proceeding commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1886, the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill also attempts to improve the patent reexamination system. It aims at closing an unfortunate administrative loophole and bridging a legal gap in the working of our patent system. The reform also comes out of two hearings that the Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property held earlier this year.

While I strongly endorse the professionalism of the Patent and Trademark Office, I believe it is necessary to place a check on the PTO's actions by affording all participants judicial review before a Federal appeals court.

□ 1545

This check by a higher independent authority is an important safeguard and adds transparency to the process. Rest assured this appellate review will not impose additional burdens on patent-holders arising from Federal trials.

This is an important and necessary amendment that is an overdue change to our intellectual property laws. I urge Members to support H.R. 1886.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1886 and urge my colleagues to vote for it. It is largely non-controversial. The Committee on the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property passed it by a voice vote on May 22, and the full committee reported it favorably by voice vote on June 20.

The bill represents a good, if small, step in improving the usefulness of the inter partes reexamination procedure for patents. Currently, the inter partes reexamination procedure places so many constraints on third-party requesters of such reexamination that, as some patent attorneys have stated, "It would be legal malpractice to recommend a client initiate an inter partes reexamination."

Among those constraints is the prohibition against a third party appealing an adverse reexamination decision to Federal court or participating in an appeal brought by the patentee.

H.R. 1886 would allow an authority requester to appeal a reexamination decision to Federal court and to participate in an appeal by an applicant. By doing so, H.R. 1886 may make inter partes reexamination a somewhat more attractive option for challenging a patent. A third party will, at the least, now feel comfortable that the courts can be accessed to rectify a mistaken reexamination decision.

While H.R. 1886 may not cure all the defects of inter partes reexamination, I believe it is a good start, and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Madam Speaker, I rise with a strong sense of concern, if not opposition, to what is being proposed here today.

Two years ago, there was a compromise that was made on this very important matter. I, in fact, supported legislation with this wording in it; but only because it was part of a compromise that I felt was necessary to get the rest of the bill through. I thought the bill that we had come up with, and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and I and Jim and others had worked so long and hard for, that it was worthy of that compromise.

However, this piece of legislation undoes a compromise that was made with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) to take this very language out of that bill, so we are, in effect, going back on a compromise made with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

I might add that I was willing to support the legislation with this concept in it, even though I had reservations about it, if it was part of a bigger bill that was, I thought, a good bill that we had come up with.

But now that we are bringing it up standing alone as part of an effort to

basically go back on the compromise of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), which he insisted on for his support of the legislation, I do not think that it stands alone and can stand on its own.

We passed a sensible reform law 2 years ago, as I say, the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999. It has provided some very solid reform, which included, again, language that was inconsistent with what they are trying to accomplish here today.

Many Members, including the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) and myself, have been very concerned about the ability of corporations and of foreign nationals to use the legal process to drag small entrepreneurs and inventors into very costly legal battles.

What we are talking about today is, instead of letting the patent office make the decision, and we have granted judicial authority to patent examiners; that is why they have a very special place in this system, so we expect them to act responsibly.

But what we are doing here is permitting a third party, we are expanding the ability of third parties to use the court system as a way to interfere with rights that have been granted to inventors by patent examiners.

We want the patent system to work, and we want these patent examiners, who have proven themselves to be people of responsibility, that is why we give them this responsibility, to be honorable people and people of great talent, and we hope they will be paid more money in the future, in fact. But then to suggest that, after the Patent Office has made its decision with these experts in technology, that we are going to permit a third party to come in and use the court system to negate that, I think that is a reason we have to think about this.

I would suggest that we hold off on this amendment and give the Congress a little chance to figure out what the effect of this will actually be on inventions in America.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the distinguished subcommittee chairman.

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Madam Speaker, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), with whom I have had disagreements and agreements, the gentleman says that this undoes what was previously agreed to. I think that is clearly subject to interpretation. We are going to have to disagree agreeably on that, and we can do that at another time.

I say, Madam Speaker, that, and pardon my incorrect grammar, but I am a pretty easy dog to hunt with. I am surprised that no one has come forward prior to today. We had a hearing April 4, the second hearing on May 10, a subcommittee markup on May 22, a full committee markup on June 20, a report

filed on June 28. Now, one would think if concerns were being felt or if anxiety was the order of the day, that someone would have rattled my door. No knock.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has already indicated this, and I will be brief. But as he said, H.R. 1886 consists of noncontroversial, in my opinion noncontroversial, amendments to the patent reexamination system. It is not a new idea, but one whose time has finally come. Fairness demands that inventors deserve their day in court should a controversy arise, but we should spare them the expense and the burdens of Federal litigation when we can. This bill achieves that important and equitable balance.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN); and I want to thank my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and all members of the subcommittee who worked very ardently in addressing this matter.

Finally, and I say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), and to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), I have had several small independent inventors come to me thanking me for the work that the subcommittee has done. These small, independent inventors say, "Now some folks claim they are on Capitol Hill representing the small inventors. We do not need anybody representing us. We are happy with what is being done at the subcommittee and full committee level."

So, Madam Speaker, I believe that the concerns that have been expressed thus far, I say to my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), I believe they can be assuaged and resolved.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to take a moment to try and address the arguments made by my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHR-ABACHER), because I think that the thrust of his argument is actually served and met by our bill, not opposed.

He is concerned, legitimately, about the likelihood that poorly financed independent inventors will have their patents challenged in expensive re-examinations requested by big corporations with deep pockets. The problem is, the way the law is now, those corporations do not go to reexamination. They ignore reexamination, because if they go to reexamination, their ability then to challenge in court on the issues they brought up in reexamination is eliminated.

So they, instead of challenging the small, independent inventor in a relatively cheap, relatively quick, somewhat informal or more informal reexamination process, that is ignored and, instead, they wait until the patent is granted. Then they go into Federal court on lengthy, incredibly expensive litigation which can take years and years at enormous expense, which

these corporations can afford if it is justified in the context of their own business plans, and grind that patent holder down in court.

What we are trying to do, and it is really a small change, is to take away the roadblock that causes people who want to challenge the validity of a patent to ignore the reexamination procedure and go to court instead. That is to say that if they win in reexamination and the patent holder appeals to court to reestablish the validity of the patent and to throw out the reexamination decision to reverse the granting of the patent, that the person who filed for a reexamination or the third party who brought the reexamination request can participate in that appeal. If they cannot, they are not going to go to reexamination, they are just going to challenge the patent in court.

H.R. 1886 in no way affects or enhances a challenger's ability to initiate a reexamination. It does not broaden the basis for doing this. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and I have some legislation that would do that and provide actually a more fulsome kind of a hearing. But we have not been able to persuade a majority of the subcommittee at this point that that is a good idea.

All this bill does is leave the substantive law exactly the same, and maintain the requirement that the PTO director still find that a substantial new question of patentability has been raised before ordering a reexamination. It in no way lowers the barrier for requesting an inter partes reexamination; it just makes it a marginally more attractive option because they are no longer prejudiced from raising an issue in court, and are perhaps persuaded by the reexamination decision.

Everyone in the patent world recognizes that a patent which has survived reexamination is a much stronger patent, much more likely to be upheld in court. I would contend that the small, independent inventor has an interest in a vital reexamination process, not one that just exists on the books and is never utilized because the person who wants to challenge that patent is afraid they are going to be estopped from ever going to court; if they lose or if they win, that they will not be able to participate in an appeal of the decision, of the PTO Office.

So I understand where the gentleman is coming from, but I think if we look through this bill, it is really very, very modest. This was not at the heart of the negotiation that enabled the original patent reform bill to go through several years ago, and I think it is a bill worthy of support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business.

Mr. MANZULLO. Madam Speaker, I rise to address my concerns with this

bill, H.R. 1886, which would alter the current process for third parties in a patent reexamination request.

As the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I have concerns that small inventors may be hurt under the proposed process allowed under this bill.

I am grateful to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) of the Committee on the Judiciary and to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE). The gentleman from Wisconsin met with me today, albeit at the 11th hour, to discuss my concerns. He very graciously agreed to hold a hearing this year on how the bill may affect the interests of the small inventor.

The chairman and the chairman of the subcommittee are extremely fair people. They are very reasonable. They are the first ones that want to make sure that this bill would do no harm to the small inventor. I appreciate their concern on it.

But I would like to put into the RECORD as I see it how the small inventor may be hurt. Patents are intellectual property rights. Patents allow inventors to keep others from using for monetary gain inventions they have created.

The reexamination process brings a patent back through the process, essentially opening up the procedures that bring about a patent.

Third-party reexamination allows any party, an individual, a company, or even a foreign Nation, the ability to officially request a reexam of a patent in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. If a third party requester does not succeed in convincing the experts of the PTO, they do not have the right to go into the Court of Appeals. That is important for the small inventor.

I am of the opinion that this bill may open a whole host of problems, particularly for the small inventor. Let me explain. Under current law, a patent can be challenged as to its validity in a Federal district court only upon a party being charged with infringement or being sued for infringement by a patent owner.

In the first case, the alleged infringer may file a declaratory judgment action to settle a dispute, thereby allowing them to go to court. In the latter case, the sued party, the alleged infringer, can challenge patent validity in an affirmative defense claim before the Federal appeals court.

H.R. 1886 would allow any third party to question the validity of a patent without first being charged for infringement. This is critical because a bad actor, again, anyone from an individual company, corporation, or foreign Nation, could essentially bottle up a truly valid patent with frivolous claims, hurting the true inventor's ability to develop his ideas.

There are concerns that this bill could cause a domino effect in the marketplace for these small inventors seeking financing to get a finished product, idea, concept, to the market.

A legitimate inventor of a significant concept would be dramatically hindered from seeking venture capital for something that is tied up in the courts by a third party reexamination, as is allowed and envisioned under H.R. 1886.

□ 1600

It enables a third-party requester to challenge as many patents in the courts as it deems necessary at a much-reduced cost to them so as to gain or maintain a stronghold in any particular industry. Therefore, I am heartened that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary through his graciousness saw me today, expressed a willingness to work with the small inventor to make sure that the small inventor was protected and the fact that he is open to holding a hearing on this issue.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Committee on Small Business. I want him to know how much I appreciate knowing of his concerns regarding the important role of our country's patent system, and I am prepared to work with him on this subject. In fact, I share his appreciation of the entrepreneurial spirit of America, whereby inventors apply their creativity and ingenuity to technology every day in this country.

I want to reassure the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) that since this issue is squarely in the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, it will fully get the proper attention it deserves.

The bill we consider today, H.R. 1886, will not prejudice inventors, small businesses or anyone else connected with inventive activity. In fact, it will help level the playing field in this area regarding the patent code procedures. This will help us achieve our goals beyond patent reexamination, which include giving investors confidence in a patented invention so that doubts can be cast aside and that capital may be raised to help in the financing of entrepreneurial concern.

Second, this bill does not create new tools for litigation to harass or abuse inventors. In the past I have opposed such legislation and will continue to do so in the future.

Finally, I appreciate the concerns that the gentleman has raised. The Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet and Intellectual Property held two hearings on this subject earlier this year. In an effort to continue exploring this vital subject, I am directing my staff to schedule a third hearing on this subject and other issues of importance to inventors.

I thank the gentleman and look forward to working with him on his issue.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1886.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REQUIRING A REPORT ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2048) to require a report on the operations of the State Justice Institute.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2048

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL ON STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE.

Section 213 of the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 (42 U.S.C. 10712) is amended by striking "On October 1, 1987" and inserting "Not later than October 1, 2002".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 2048, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2048 will require the Attorney General to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary regarding the effectiveness of the State Justice Institute. This report would be due by October 1, 2002.

Congress established SJI as a private, nonprofit corporation in 1984. Its stated purpose is to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in State courts. SJI is to accomplish this goal by providing funds to State courts and other national organizations or nonprofit organizations which support the State courts. SJI also fosters coordination and cooperation with the Federal judiciary in areas of mutual concern.

Since becoming operational in 1987, the institute has awarded more than \$125 million in grants to support over 1,000 projects; another \$40 million in matching requirements has been gen-

erated from other public and private funding sources. As noted, H.R. 2048 would require the Attorney General to study the operations of the institute and release a report on its effectiveness. After 14 years and \$165 million in grants, it is now more appropriate to take a closer look at the efficiency and effectiveness of this institute and the project it supports.

Madam Speaker, this concludes my description of the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time I may consume.

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2048. This bill was marked up and favorably reported by voice vote by the Committee on the Judiciary on July 24. It is wholly non-controversial.

It requires the Attorney General in consultation with the State Justice Institute to submit a report to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary regarding the effectiveness of the institute. The report will be due no later than October 1, 2002.

The SJI is a useful project. Congress created it in 1984 to provide funds to improve the quality of justice in State courts. Congress also directed the SJI to facilitate enhanced coordination between State and Federal courts and develop solutions to common problems faced by all courts. It was last reauthorized in 1992. That expired in fiscal year 1996.

While the Committee on Appropriations has continued to appropriate approximately \$7 million annually for the State Justice Institute, it has not been formally reauthorized since 1996 by the authorizing committee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

The ultimate purpose of the SJI report mandated by this legislation is to aid Congress in reauthorizing the SJI. With the information from this report, Congress can ensure that SJI reauthorization is accomplished with all due diligence.

The Attorney General did issue a study of its effectiveness in 1987, but this report provides little information, as the SJI did not become operational until 1987. So we need a new report to help inform future legislation to reauthorize it.

H.R. 2048 is a good bill, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) pretty well laid this out.

I would just indicate that by noting that the 1984 legislation which created

the institute required the Attorney General to submit a report governing the effectiveness of the State Justice Institute's operations by October 1, 1987, to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary. Since SJI did not become operational until fiscal year 1987, the report submitted by former Attorney General Meese is of limited value in assessing the operations of the institute.

H.R. 2048 simply changes the due date for a report that will be identical in scope to the 1987 study. Unlike the previous effort, however, the study that will emanate from H.R. 2048 will be based on at least 14 years' worth of operations at the institute. As a result, Congress should have the first real comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of SJI by October 1, 2002.

Madam Speaker, this is a non-controversial bill, as has been indicated. It promotes good government. While I am impressed with SJI operations to date, all Federal entities should be accountable to the taxpayers. I therefore urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2048.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 233) recognizing the important relationship between the United States and Mexico.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 233

Whereas the United States and Mexico share a special bilateral friendship which is matched by few other countries in the world;

Whereas the United States and Mexico are partners joined by geography as well as by a multitude of government-to-government and private relationships which are of critical importance to both countries;

Whereas the United States and Mexico share concerns on a wide range of issues, including trade, immigration, the environment, economic development, and regional security and stability;

Whereas Vicente Fox Quesada of the Alliance for Change (consisting of the National Action Party and the Mexican Green Party) was sworn in as President of the United Mexican States on December 1, 2000, the first opposition candidate to be elected president in Mexico in seven decades;

Whereas the United States, as Mexico's neighbor, ally, and partner in the hemi-

sphere, has a strong interest in President Fox's success in promoting prosperity and democracy in his country and the region during his term of office; and

Whereas President Vicente Fox is making a state visit to Washington, D.C. on September 5-7, 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) welcomes the state visit by the President of the United Mexican States, Vicente Fox Quesada; and

(2) declares that, in keeping with the just interests of the United States, the special nature of the relationship between the United States and Mexico should be further cultivated to the mutual benefit of both countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, just over 1 year ago, on July 2, 2000, an extraordinary event took place. In a single day the people of Mexico peacefully ended 7 decades of one-party rule with their votes. Tomorrow, the man they elected as their president, Vicente Fox, will address a joint meeting of Congress as part of the first State visit hosted by George W. Bush.

The inauguration of Vicente Fox as Mexico's president has ushered in a new chapter in our Nation's relationship with our neighbor to the south. President Bush and President Fox have seized the opportunity to forge a new partnership. Both leaders have acted to leave the past and build a road to the future based on real shared interests.

The cornerstone of our relationship with Mexico is the North America Free Trade Agreement, initiated under the President's father's administration.

Commerce between the United States and Mexico increased from \$83 billion in 1994 to nearly \$200 billion in 1999. Total trade among the three NAFTA members, including Canada, reached \$557 billion in 1999. Mexico has surpassed Japan as the United States's second largest trading partner. Even so, there is a belief abroad in our land that NAFTA is the culprit for the present economic downturn. This is simply not true.

The implementation of NAFTA, in fact, coincided with the longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of our Nation.

The trafficking of illicit narcotics through Mexico has left a swath of cor-

ruption and misery in its path. Securing Mexico's full cooperation in addressing the drug threat has long bedeviled our relations. President Fox has, however, demonstrated great courage in facing this violent and corrosive threat to the security of both of our nations. Under his leadership, Mexico has finally begun to extradite Mexican drug kingpins to face justice in the United States for their crimes.

Under President Fox's leadership, real law enforcement cooperation has begun at the working level where it counts, policeman to policeman.

Migration is at the top of our bilateral agenda with Mexico. The U.S. Census of 2000 revealed that almost 12 percent of the U.S. population is of Hispanic origin. Mexicans and Mexican-Americans constitute about 65 percent of that total. President Bush believes it is very important that America be a Nation that welcomes immigrants. He recognizes the huge contributions to our economy that immigrant workers, including Mexicans, have made and the vital role America has in welcoming people who will fulfill that role in our economy.

□ 1615

Accordingly, President Bush and President Fox have been working to establish a series of principles regarding migration issues that will be announced during President Fox's state visit.

Madam Speaker, the resolution before the House today recognizes the extraordinarily important bilateral relationship between the United States and Mexico, and welcomes the state visit by Mexico's democratically elected leader, President Vicente Fox.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), introduced a similar resolution earlier this year, and I am pleased he is among the Members from both parties, including the ranking member of our Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who have cosponsored this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for his leadership and for his sponsorship of this resolution, House Resolution 233, and I endorse the resolution, and also recognize the support of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on International Relations.

I also acknowledge the support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER),

and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Madam Speaker, the resolution celebrates the unique bilateral relationship that the United States shares with its other neighbor, Mexico. It also acknowledges the pivotal role that Mexico plays in addressing issues that are of concern to both the United States and Mexico. And finally, the resolution welcomes President Fox to the United States.

Since assuming office in December of last year, President Fox has done much to build a new Mexico, a Mexico which tolerates diverse political views, which is accountable to its citizenry; and it is certainly a remarkable effort on the part of his leadership, and the fact that after 70 years, for the first time, a new political leader has come before the voters of Mexico and been elected, someone other than the party that has been presiding over Mexico's politics for the last 70 years.

Largely as a result of the efforts of President Fox's administration, Mexico's government now embraces divergent viewpoints, its press corps has become increasingly vigilant and vocal, and Mexican political society has become more vibrant and quite robust.

Oftentimes in collaboration with the United States Government, President Fox's administration has also recorded unprecedented victories in the fight against drug cartels and smugglers of illegal immigrants from other countries.

President Fox's administration continues to face significant challenges, including tensions in Chiapas, a softening economy, and entrenched corruption in some segments of the government, and accounting for Mexico's past human rights violations.

Madam Speaker, I commend President Fox for his outstanding leadership and real sense of commitment to address the social and economic problems currently confronting some 29 million indigenous Indians now living in Mexico. The indigenous Indians of Mexico have suffered tremendous hardships economically and socially, mainly due to negligence and indifference by previous administrations. President Fox is the first among Mexico's top leaders to seriously address the needs of indigenous Indians, especially the crisis that occurred in Chiapas in the Yucatan Peninsula whereby the needs of indigenous Indians of that region of Mexico have not been properly addressed by Mexican authorities.

How ironic that during the 1860s when Mexico fought a revolution against French rule, the gentleman who led the revolution against French rule and who later became Mexico's

first president after the revolution was an indigenous Indian by the name of Benito Juarez. Over 100 years later, the issues affecting the lives of the indigenous Indians of Mexico have finally been brought to the attention of President Fox. I sincerely commend President Fox for his sensitivity and true sense of compassion in establishing national policy that will allow indigenous Indians to seek opportunities not only for higher education, but better health and better living conditions.

Madam Speaker, although these challenges are daunting, I firmly believe President Fox and his administration have the determination, the skill and the knowledge to address these issues successfully. I urge my colleagues to join me in pledging their support to President Fox, his administration, and Mexico's national parliament in their continuing efforts to address these and other issues of mutual concern.

Madam Speaker, as indicated earlier by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), President Fox will address a joint session of Congress tomorrow. To President Fox and his delegation I say, "Bienvenidos a los Estados Unidos," welcome to the United States. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 233, which recognizes the important relationship between the U.S. and Mexico.

Madam Speaker, like many Americans, I have been impressed by Mexico President Fox's policies on a wide range of fronts. We congratulate him, and the Mexican people, on their commitment to democracy, which has been demonstrated in the revolutionary changes undertaken in the run-up to the most recent election, in the conduct of that election, and in its aftermath.

President Fox has broken new ground regarding counter-narcotics cooperation, economic reform, the fight against corruption and illegal immigration into Mexico en route to the United States. It is in the American national interest that he succeeds in all these fields.

For Mexico's economic reforms to take root, however, it must end its long-standing prohibition against foreign investment in its energy sector. The current prohibition has proved to be an enormous impediment to progress in Mexico. Currently, Mexico produces 3.8 million barrels of oil a day, the fifth-largest producer in the world. But, if it developed all the oil resources that it has, it could produce 6 million barrels a day, the second largest producer, according to the well-known firm, Cambridge Energy Research Associates.

The growth potential for its gas sector is even more dramatic. Mexico is currently producing 4.5 billion cubic feet per day. But according to Cambridge Energy Associates, Mexico could more than double this to 10 billion cubic feet per day. Canada, in fact, pro-

duces four times as much gas as Mexico even though both countries have the same amount of gas reserves. Currently Mexico actually imports natural gas from the United States, when the situation if anything, should be the reverse.

Yet, opening up the Mexican energy sector to foreign investment is just the first step towards the economic take-off that both Mexico and the United States seek. Once they increase their energy capacity, Mexico should resist the temptation to play politics with the Organization of Petroleum Exporters. Mexico, it should be recalled, and before President Fox took power, was a key player in pushing oil prices up from \$10 a barrel in 1999 to today's \$25 a barrel, when it colluded with Venezuela and Saudi Arabia to limit production. Its Minister has publicly boasted of this effort.

The oil price rise that they helped to engineer staggered our US economy. Richard Berner, chief economist at Morgan Stanley Dean Whitter, estimates that every \$5 increase in the price of a barrel of oil knocks 0.3 percentage points off of our GDP. The price rise since 1999 represents one full percentage of our GDP, or hundreds of thousands of jobs. And the irony of course, is that the energy price rise that Mexico helped to create ended up hurting its own economy because of the repercussions it had on the United States economy.

What does all this mean for the United States and for Mexico? Clearly, the US welcomes our new relationship with Mexico. But if we are going to take this relationship up the next level—including improved treatment for the millions of Mexicans who are in this country illegally—we must have a new deal regarding Mexican energy production. Foreign investment and an end to Mexican cooperation with OPEC will serve the interests of both of our countries by opening the flood-gates of Mexican energy production and undermining the OPEC cartel. Cheaper energy will benefit the entire world economy—not least of all the United States and President Fox of Mexico.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HYDE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE CHRIS CANNON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jeff Hartley, Director of Communications for the Honorable CHRIS CANNON, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 2, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a deposition subpoena issued by the Third District Court, Salt Lake Department, State of Utah, in a civil case pending there.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that it is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House to comply with the subpoena.

Sincerely,

JEFF HARTLEY,
Director of Communications.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Government Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, August 30, 2001.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER. This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that the Custodian of Records, Committee on Government Reform has received a subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 2291, by the yeas and nays;

House Resolution 233, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for the second vote in this series.

DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2291, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2291, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 1, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

YEAS—402

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Arney
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito

Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans

Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooey
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer

Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez

Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Solis
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock

NAYS—1

Flake

NOT VOTING—28

Barton
Carson (IN)
Crane
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
Etheridge
Foley
Frank
Green (TX)

Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hinchey
Horn
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Lampson
Lipinski
McNulty
Mica
Mollohan
Nadler
Pascrell
Paul
Rangel
Reyes
Sherman
Traffant
Young (AK)

Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins (OK)
Watson (CA)
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

□ 1825

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 333, H.R. 2291 I was unavoidably detained due to a delayed air flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 333, regarding H.R. 2291 I was unavoidably delayed because of delays in my airplane travel from Houston due to rain storm delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote No. 333. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 233.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 233, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Boswell	Coyne
Ackerman	Boucher	Cramer
Aderholt	Boyd	Crenshaw
Akin	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Allen	Brady (TX)	Cubin
Andrews	Brown (FL)	Culberson
Armey	Brown (OH)	Cummings
Baca	Brown (SC)	Cunningham
Bachus	Bryant	Davis (CA)
Baird	Burr	Davis (FL)
Baker	Burton	Davis (IL)
Baldacci	Buyer	Davis, Jo Ann
Baldwin	Callahan	Davis, Tom
Ballenger	Calvert	Deal
Barcia	Camp	DeGette
Barr	Cannon	Delahunt
Barrett	Cantor	DeLauro
Bartlett	Capito	DeMint
Bass	Capps	Deutsch
Becerra	Capuano	Diaz-Balart
Bentsen	Cardin	Dicks
Bereuter	Carson (OK)	Dingell
Berkley	Castle	Doggett
Berman	Chabot	Dooley
Berry	Chambliss	Doolittle
Biggart	Clay	Doyle
Bilirakis	Clayton	Dreier
Bishop	Clement	Duncan
Blagojevich	Clyburn	Dunn
Blumenauer	Coble	Edwards
Blunt	Collins	Ehlers
Boehlert	Combest	Ehrlich
Boehner	Condit	Emerson
Bonilla	Conyers	Engel
Bonior	Cooksey	English
Bono	Costello	Eshoo
Borski	Cox	Evans

Everett	Lantos	Rogers (KY)
Farr	Largent	Rogers (MI)
Fattah	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher
Ferguson	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	Latham	Ross
Flake	LaTourette	Rothman
Fletcher	Leach	Roukema
Forbes	Lee	Roybal-Allard
Ford	Levin	Royce
Fossella	Lewis (CA)	Rush
Frelinghuysen	Lewis (GA)	Ryan (WI)
Frost	Lewis (KY)	Ryun (KS)
Gallely	Linder	Sabo
Ganske	LoBiondo	Sanchez
Gekas	Lofgren	Sanders
Gephardt	Lowey	Sandlin
Gibbons	Lucas (KY)	Sawyer
Gilchrest	Lucas (OK)	Saxton
Gillmor	Luther	Scarborough
Gilman	Maloney (CT)	Schaffer
Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)	Schakowsky
Goode	Manzullo	Schiff
Goodlatte	Markey	Schrock
Gordon	Mascara	Scott
Goss	Matheson	Sensenbrenner
Graham	Matsui	Serrano
Granger	McCarthy (MO)	Sessions
Graves	McCarthy (NY)	Shadegg
Green (TX)	McCollum	Shaw
Green (WI)	McCrery	Shays
Greenwood	McDermott	Sherwood
Grucci	McGovern	Shimkus
Gutierrez	McHugh	Shows
Gutknecht	McInnis	Shuster
Hall (OH)	McIntyre	Simmons
Hall (TX)	McKeon	Simpson
Hansen	McKinney	Skeen
Harman	Meehan	Skelton
Hart	Meek (FL)	Slaughter
Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)	Smith (MI)
Hayworth	Menendez	Smith (NJ)
Hefley	Mica	Smith (TX)
Herger	Millender	Smith (WA)
Hill	McDonald	Snyder
Hilleary	Miller (FL)	Solis
Hilliard	Miller, Gary	Souder
Hinchee	Miller, George	Spratt
Hinojosa	Mink	Stark
Hobson	Moore	Stearns
Hoeffel	Moran (KS)	Stenholm
Hoekstra	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Holden	Morella	Stump
Holt	Myrick	Stupak
Honda	Napolitano	Sununu
Hooley	Neal	Sweeney
Hostettler	Nethercutt	Tancred
Houghton	Ney	Tanner
Hoyer	Northup	Tauscher
Hulshof	Norwood	Tauzin
Hunter	Nussle	Taylor (MS)
Hyde	Oberstar	Taylor (NC)
Inslee	Obey	Terry
Isakson	Olver	Thomas
Israel	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Issa	Osborne	Thompson (MS)
Istook	Ose	Thornberry
Jackson (IL)	Otter	Thune
Jackson-Lee	Owens	Thurman
(TX)	Oxley	Tiahrt
Jefferson	Pallone	Tiberi
Jenkins	Pastor	Tierney
John	Paul	Toomey
Johnson (CT)	Payne	Towns
Johnson (IL)	Pelosi	Turner
Johnson, E. B.	Pence	Udall (CO)
Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)	Udall (NM)
Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)	Upton
Jones (OH)	Petri	Velazquez
Kanjorski	Phelps	Visclosky
Kaptur	Pickering	Vitter
Keller	Pitts	Walden
Kelly	Platts	Walsh
Kennedy (MN)	Pombo	Wamp
Kennedy (RI)	Pomeroy	Waters
Kerns	Portman	Watkins (OK)
Kildee	Price (NC)	Watson (CA)
Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)	Watt (NC)
Kind (WI)	Putnam	Watts (OK)
King (NY)	Quinn	Waxman
Kingston	Radanovich	Weiner
Kirk	Rahall	Weldon (FL)
Kleczka	Ramstad	Weldon (PA)
Knollenberg	Regula	Weller
Kolbe	Rehberg	Wexler
Kucinich	Reynolds	Whitfield
LaFalce	Rivers	Wicker
LaHood	Rodriguez	
Langevin	Roemer	

Wilson	Woolsey	Wynn
Wolf	Wu	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Barton	Hastings (FL)	Nadler
Carson (IN)	Hayes	Pascarell
Crane	Horn	Rangel
DeFazio	Lampson	Reyes
DeLay	Lipinski	Riley
Etheridge	McNulty	Sherman
Foley	Mollohan	Trafigant
Frank	Murtha	Young (AK)

□ 1842

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2107

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 2107.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 2586, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEAR 2002

(Mrs. MYRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, this morning a Dear Colleague letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet early in the week of September 10 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 2586, the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002.

The bill was ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services on August 1 and the committee report was filed yesterday. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H 312 in the Capitol no later than 2 p.m. on Friday, September 7.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of H.R. 2586, as ordered reported by the Committee on Armed Services. That text is available at the Committee on Armed Services or on its Web site. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

MAKING IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2001, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 51, APPROVING EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT WITH RESPECT TO PRODUCTS OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on September 5, 2001, or any day thereafter, to consider in the House the joint resolution (House Joint Resolution 51) approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint resolution and against its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and a Member opposed to the joint resolution; and that consistent with section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2001 CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2833, VIETNAM HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on the legislative day of Thursday, September 6, 2001, without intervention of any point of order, to consider in the House H.R. 2833, the Vietnam Human Rights Act; that the bill be considered as read for amendment; that the bill be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE REGARDING DEATH OF THE HONORABLE FLOYD SPENCE FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 234) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 234

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honor-

able FLOYD SPENCE, a Representative from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these solutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the House adjourns today, it adjourn as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for 1 hour.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, while we were on recess, FLOYD SPENCE, a native South Carolinian, a friend of us all, and a Member of excellent standing passed away.

FLOYD was a star athlete, a student leader, a naval officer in Korea, a State legislator, and a pioneer Republican in a State that, at the time, was thoroughly Democratic.

For 30 long, dedicated years he served here proudly, with total loyalty to this grand old institution of the Republic and to the Armed Forces of the United States, whom he effectively represented on the Committee on Armed Services for all of that time, 6 of them as a very able chairman of the committee.

Many Members overcome obstructions or hurdles or suffer hardships to serve here. Few of us endure what FLOYD SPENCE endured, a double lung transplant. At the time, he was one of the few in America ever to survive such a procedure. I can recall his recounting how after the operation every movement of his body was excruciatingly painful. Yet, even though he had reason, I never heard him complain. I never heard him express anxiety about his condition. I never heard him boast.

I often heard him stand before groups, particularly from South Carolina, and tell them, "I am glad to be here." He would pause a minute and say, "Heck, I am glad to be anywhere." It was that kind of understated humor, that kind of affability, that kind of civility, that made him the gentleman from South Carolina on this floor, in the committee, not just in name but in the truest sense of the word. He left us all a worthy example to emulate, personally and professionally.

To his family, to his four proud sons, to Debbie, his wife, we extend our heartfelt sorrow. We will miss FLOYD too, but rest assured, we will always, always, remember him, and never forget his courage, his spirit, and the sterling example he left us of what it means to serve in this great institution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ).

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing FLOYD SPENCE for about 20 years. He was my good friend.

Just like my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), says, he had a great sense of humor. I can remember when one day he said, You know, I have more spare parts than a used car dealer.

He was a great gentleman. I loved him. My family loved him, and Debbie, who nourished him when he had the double lung transplant. When we would see FLOYD, as the gentleman said, we would ask, "You have a new suit?" And he would say, "No, it is secondhand used." This was the kind of guy he was. We loved him.

To Debbie and his sons: We are going to miss this great American.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, I rise with a heavy heart today as we pay tribute to a friend, a colleague, and a stalwart for our nation's armed services and the country. FLOYD SPENCE and I were friends for as long as I have been in Congress.

In addition to his zeal and dedication on behalf of his constituents in his beloved South Carolina, I admired his outlook on life.

FLOYD was determined to squeeze every drop of life he could from his time on this earth—and he succeeded.

From the double lung transplant to the kidney transplant, FLOYD said he had more spare parts than a used car dealer. What was amazing was that he survived all this for so long. He had an amazing ability to recover from deadly afflictions.

He was supremely dedicated to his duty to South Carolina, to our armed services, and to the United States of America. I know this because I traveled with FLOYD to places on every part of this planet to inspect our military bases. Wherever we went, he insisted we talk to enlisted men, not just the generals.

Our nation has lost a great hero. I have lost my friend, mi amigo.

I offer Debbie and his children—David, Zack, Benjamin and Caldwell—my deepest condolences for their loss.

FLOYD loved his family so very much. It was Debbie, when FLOYD had the double lung transplant and was at his lowest, who gave him the support and encouragement he needed, and nursed him back to health.

FLOYD had a stubborn resolution to live, to enjoy life. He knew his time was one day at a time—he told me that each day was extra icing on the cake of his life. The antirejection medicine he took greatly diminished his ability to ward off simple infections.

I will miss that giant of a man with a laugh he was quick to share. The camaraderie often noted as now missing in the House of Representatives had led our critics, and ourselves, leads people to say that we lack either bipartisanship or simple human trust.

But because of my friendships with so many of my Republican colleagues, most notably my friend FLOYD SPENCE, I know the trust we engender here is real and it works on behalf of the American people.

We may disagree on the issues of the day, but we are united in our belief that close bipartisan relationships serve all of us and the American people we represent.

I will miss you, FLOYD. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for speeding our consideration of this resolution today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution recognizing the tragic and untimely death of our friend, colleague, and former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, FLOYD SPENCE. He was a patriot, most of all a gentleman, and one of Congress' most ardent supporters and tireless advocates for our Nation's military.

During his long and distinguished career in the military and then public service, FLOYD devoted his life to the belief that there are certain principles worth defending: freedom, democracy, and the promise of global stability achieved through a policy of peace through strength.

As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, FLOYD led our committee and this country through many tough times. It was largely due to his efforts that we were able to reverse the trend of the decline in spending for our military.

FLOYD leaves behind a proud legacy of accomplishment and service to our Nation and to the Armed Forces to which every public servant should aspire. It was a privilege to serve with him. I will miss him as a leader, a colleague, and most of all, a friend.

It is only fitting that we send FLOYD off with a traditional Navy farewell wish: fair winds and following seas.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), a ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE was a true southern gentleman, a good friend, a dedicated Congressman, and a champion of a strong national defense. I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with him on the Committee on Armed Services during his chairmanship, and I found that he always worked for the betterment of our men and women in uniform and for our national security. I will miss him. I will miss him very much.

Almost a year ago, an overflow crowd gathered in the Committee on Armed Services hearing room for the unveiling of FLOYD's portrait as chairman of the committee. Often we do not have the chance to let friends know how we feel about them before they are gone, so I am very grateful that we had that evening together to enjoy FLOYD's company, and to let him know personally how much he meant to us.

FLOYD SPENCE began serving this country as an active duty member of the United States Navy Reserve during the Korean conflict. That service continued until the end of his life.

Our former chairman understood that our Nation needs a strong national defense, and he worked tirelessly with Members on both sides of the aisle to strengthen our Armed Forces and to take care of the men and women in uniform and their families. No one

spoke out more forcefully on the need to maintain readiness.

On rare occasions we disagreed, but never disagreeably. Our relationship was one of mutual respect based upon values which we both learned in small towns named Lexington, one in South Carolina and one in Missouri.

During the years FLOYD SPENCE served on the Committee on Armed Services, he blessed us with his leadership, honored us with his friendship, and inspired us with his courage. FLOYD SPENCE was courteous, he was thoughtful, he was respectful of others. It was a pleasure for me to serve in Congress with this decent, fair, and honorable man. We are all the richer for his years of dedicated service to the Committee on Armed Services, the Congress of the United States, the people of South Carolina, and our Nation.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, Debbie, to his four sons, and to his entire family.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a true American hero and a former POW.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Tonight I rise to pay tribute to a great American. Everybody has said it, he was, and he was also a true patriot, my friend, FLOYD SPENCE.

FLOYD and I first became friends when I came to the Congress in 1991. As a career Air Force fighter pilot for 29 years, I felt inclined to keep abreast of issues of importance to our national security and Armed Forces. Knowing my passion for the military, FLOYD went out of his way to update me early and often, even though I had not served on his committee.

In fact, because I was a POW in Vietnam and also a veteran of the Korean War, FLOYD turned to me in confidence regarding issues before his committees, the Committee on Veterans Affairs and the Committee on Armed Services, and he found it important to hear an outside perspective.

He was a true conservative. He did support our American military and our American way of life in all that he did. FLOYD was a true friend and a faithful leader for our men and women in the Armed Forces, and he always put our services' interest first and foremost.

Mr. Speaker, just this year FLOYD traveled with us to the Paris air show, where he looked there at foreign airplanes and ours in demonstration, and how proud he was of our own Armed Forces when they were out there performing before the world. It was a reflection that just made me admire him all the more.

□ 1900

In reflection, I am sad that I can no longer turn to my friend FLOYD on the floor. His family and friends are in my thoughts and prayers. I know he is in a better place. FLOYD SPENCE was and is a great American.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me time as we join tonight in true bipartisan fashion to remember and pay tribute to our great and good friend, FLOYD SPENCE.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) outlined the resume of accomplishments of our friend FLOYD, the fact that he was a star athlete at the University of South Carolina. Now that football season has started, I think of his beloved Gamecocks that have had great success last year and promise in this season. He was captain of the track team, one who served this country with distinction as an officer in the Navy. The gentleman from South Carolina is right: he set the pace for a Republican birth really in the 20th century in South Carolina in 1962.

He came to this institution 3 decades ago. Mr. Speaker, I think of the lives he has touched, the difference he made for this Nation, not with grand and glorious orations, but with simple acts of kindness and repeated instances of a healthy dose of common sense.

He understood that our Constitution clearly calls for this Nation and this Government to provide for the common defense. He made no bones about his feelings and his priority for national security. And through it all in his days here he showed us the gift of being able to disagree without being disagreeable. Mr. Speaker, no Member of this House is as beloved as our friend FLOYD.

We thank him for his service. We thank his family and the State of South Carolina for giving us in this House a remarkable public servant.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I walked in this place in 1980, and I was asked to sit on the Committee on Ethics. Nobody wants to serve on the Committee on Ethics, but the ranking member of the Committee on Ethics happened to be FLOYD SPENCE. FLOYD served there for years and years and years.

We had a horrible case right off the bat. It was called the sex scandal with pages made up by CBS and one of their reporters. FLOYD handled that with more dignity than I have ever seen anyone handle anything. He was the ranking member, and he served longer on that committee than anybody in this House.

I hate to admit it, but I matched it at 14 years when I was on the Committee on Ethics. He did that with great distinction. I remember when we used to watch FLOYD come across in a wheelchair with his girl Carolyn pulling him across there with the oxygen. He heard of a doctor down in Mississippi who could do a double lung

transplant, a doctor from India. He did this with a young boy who was killed on a motorcycle. He became very close to the family. He called the mother Mom. She used to come up here. They were very close. That is what we would expect from a man like FLOYD SPENCE, a man who was a Navy captain himself, who had more compassion for people than most I have ever seen in my life. I stand amazed at the compassion he had and point out what a gentleman he was. It is too bad there are not more southern gentlemen left in America today, a person who always opened the door for somebody, a person who took somebody for what they were and not what they could give them. This is the kind of person that FLOYD SPENCE was.

I have to say that the people who wear the uniform today, if you are watching this today and you are a private or a general, you owe an awful lot to FLOYD SPENCE. I do not know a man among this bunch of 435 of us who looked out more for the military. He used to say, I make no bones about it. I will take care of our military boys, our enlisted kids, our officers; and we will have the best we can.

He left a legacy for all of us. I appreciate FLOYD SPENCE. To his wife, Debbie, and his family, we wish them the very best.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE was a good, a valued, and valuable Member of this House. He will be missed greatly. I want his family to know and all of his friends and constituents what a tremendous contribution he has made to the country. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) just outlined in brief form the contributions he made to our armed services.

FLOYD SPENCE was a living, breathing, walking miracle and he knew it. It affected his life, and it affected all of us who knew FLOYD.

I had a friendship with him my entire 23 years here. He began service earlier than that. We shared a passion for planting trees on our respective acreage in South Carolina and Nebraska. We are members of the same religious denomination. We talked about religion and its importance to us many times. Mostly, I knew FLOYD SPENCE because of his involvement with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, formerly known as the North Atlantic Assembly. I chair that delegation and have since 1995. FLOYD, much senior to me, was a very valuable member of that delegation. All of us on that delegation, Republicans, Democrats and our spouses and staff, miss the tremendous contributions that he has made. We miss them already.

He was a member of the Defense and Security Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and, of course, as a chairman and then former chairman of our House Committee on Armed

Services, his word was greatly respected and sought after in that assembly. FLOYD did not speak often; but when he did, people listened. At our last meeting he was an important contributor on a discussion about national missile defense. Regardless of how one feels about that subject, he made us proud that he was a Member of the House of Representatives.

So to Debbie and their four sons, whom he talked about all the time, and their families, we offer our most sincere condolences. FLOYD made a major contribution to this country. We thank him, we thank you, his family, for sharing his talent and his courageous character with this House.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), one of FLOYD's closest friends.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I recall when a number of us went down a few days ago to the memorial service in South Carolina, I thought one of the great parts of the eulogy when FLOYD's doctor who did the double lung transplant read the nurses' notes that were transcribed the day that FLOYD got married, shortly after the operation. He read the nurses' notes saying, "It appears now people are filing into the hospital room for a marriage." She seemed to be somewhat surprised by that, and later on it said in fact the marriage ceremony had taken place; and she concluded, "The patient has tolerated the marriage well so far."

I thought that was a great remark and reflection on FLOYD SPENCE's life because FLOYD SPENCE tolerated a lot of things well. He tolerated discord and disharmony and tough times and times when it seemed like all of political opinion was going against you very well. But he was a man of steel. It has been mentioned he was a man of great civility. He also had literally an absolute iron backbone. I can remember watching FLOYD SPENCE tell a Speaker of the House in no uncertain terms no, something that is pretty difficult to do.

I recall his days talking to STROM THURMOND back in the early 1960s, and he said, I think I am going to change parties and become a Republican. STROM THURMOND said, I do not think the district is ready for that. The district was not ready for it. I think he lost his first election but later on was sent to a seat in the House of Representatives. He talked about that day, and whether you are a Democrat or a Republican you have to admire the absolute iron will of this guy who walked down the streets of his hometown having changed parties in a State that still remembered the War between the States, and where lots of folks had lots of ancestors who lost parts of their bodies in the Civil War and lost lots of other things and was still a place where there was feelings about that war and about Mr. Lincoln's armies.

FLOYD SPENCE walked down the streets of his hometown and had peo-

ple, friends and neighbors, who had known him for years turn their backs on him. I recall he said he walked into the post office and an old friend who had been with him for years walked up to him, turned his back up to him deliberately and said, I used to have a great friend but now he is dead, and walked away.

I thought, what a remarkable resolution and resolve and strength this guy had to have to do that at a time when it was very, very difficult politically. Yet, with this great strength and determination and resolve that resided in FLOYD SPENCE's heart, we never heard him brag. The only people he talked about, if he was talking about his family, were his grandkids and his kids and all of his wonderful daughters-in-law.

FLOYD SPENCE left us with a legacy of civility. If we follow that legacy of civility, along with the resolve to follow our principles as strongly as he did, we will continue to be a great Nation.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to add to what the gentleman just told. The best part of the doctor's story was he said he was beeped. He thought surely something happened to FLOYD. He was well away from the hospital so he rushed to the telephone. He called the number. They put FLOYD on the phone; and he said to the surgeon, Doctor, I am getting married. He said, Fine. That is wonderful. When? FLOYD said, Right now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, we honor a great American and a great South Carolinian who will be sorely missed not only here in the halls of Congress but in the entire Nation.

His leadership in the area of national security is without equal. FLOYD SPENCE had been hailed by Democrats and Republicans for devotion to God and country. He spent his career fighting for our men and women in uniform. He was a strong advocate of improving the life of military personnel including pay raises and better living conditions. He understood that a well-trained and equipped military is the first priority by the Federal Government and the best way to preserve the peace.

FLOYD leaves behind a legacy of accomplishment that includes service in the United States Navy, 6 years in the South Carolina House, 4 years in the Senate and 3 decades in the United States House of Representatives.

In 1971 he was the first House Member to sponsor a constitutional amendment calling for a balanced budget.

He served for 13 years as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Ethics, and he also chaired with distinction the House Committee on Armed Services from 1995 to 2000.

FLOYD SPENCE was one of our most distinguished patriotic public servants as well as a southern gentleman in the best of the tradition. He was a great colleague and a wonderful friend. His

guidance, optimism, statesmanship, and strong leadership will be missed by all that knew him. He was a mentor to me and a great friend. God bless FLOYD SPENCE and his family.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on this occasion to join our colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend FLOYD SPENCE, to the people of South Carolina, of expressing our heartfelt condolences to the family of our distinguished friend FLOYD.

FLOYD was a true southern gentleman, a good friend to many of us, a committed husband and father, and a dedicated public servant to the men and women of our armed forces and to the people of South Carolina and to his beloved Nation.

I have had the pleasure and honor of serving in the Congress with FLOYD for more than 3 decades.

□ 1915

As a Navy veteran, he was a staunch, unwavering advocate for our men and women in uniform. As chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, he fought tirelessly to improve the quality of life for our military personnel.

FLOYD was a man of great perseverance. From his early football injury through his more recent lung transplant, FLOYD continued to give all he had to others, and he committed his life to fully serving his people in South Carolina.

FLOYD SPENCE was elected to serve the Second District of South Carolina in the House of Representatives in 1970 and served some 15 terms. In 1971, he was the first House Member to sponsor a constitutional amendment calling for a balanced budget. He served for 13 years as the ranking Republican on the Committee on Ethical Conduct, and in 1995 was named chairman of the Committee on Armed Services where he served with distinction, always keeping in mind the national security of our great Nation.

Georgia and I join the many friends and Members of this body in sending our prayers and condolences to his wife, Deborah, his four sons, David, Zack, Benjamin and Caldwell, and to all of the members of the Spence family. FLOYD's public service was a testimony to his life, a model for all of us. He will be sorely missed, not only by his colleagues, but by the entire Nation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, being from South Carolina and in politics, having people around for awhile is not an unusual circumstance. Senator THURMOND, most people recognize his name, was elected in 1954; I was born in 1955. We tend to keep people around.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) led this debate, and I know that the family is very appreciative of all of the kind

words. In South Carolina we pride ourselves on being a delegation that comes together for the good of the State, and remembers our upbringing pretty well. Every now and then we fuss and fight, but I doubt if my colleagues will find any Democrat or Republican in this body that ever had a disagreement with FLOYD, that they walked away from that disagreement believing anything less of the man. That is something we are losing in the country.

I have been in politics since 1994. It has been a contentious time, but we have done a lot. In a delegation this small, Members get to know each other pretty well, and FLOYD SPENCE was the nicest person I have ever met in political life. That is saying a lot coming from my State, because most of us try to be nice to each other. And the fact that so many Members came to speak of his kindness and his commitment to the men and women in the military proves that Members can be quiet and make loud statements.

FLOYD will not be known by the volume that he carried, but by what was in his heart. FLOYD did change parties. At the time that was tough, but I do not know of any Democrats back home that thought that FLOYD SPENCE was anything other than a gentleman. Any disagreements with FLOYD were political, never personal.

He had a devoted wife, Debbie, and many Members know about that situation. The marriage that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was referring to was to his second wife, Debbie Spence, who was a devoted wife and friend to FLOYD, and they were married in the hospital right after his historic double-lung transplant. I have never met anyone more devoted to their spouse than Debbie. FLOYD often said he was blessed to have two special women in his life. FLOYD was also very proud of his four sons. He said he had four boys that all married female women. To know FLOYD, that made sense. He was very proud of his family and his grandchildren.

In the 10 years-plus after he received a double-lung transplant and eventually a kidney transplant, he said, this is my second life.

Mr. Speaker, FLOYD appreciated every day the good Lord gave him. He has a group of grandchildren, varied ages, some of them very, very young. They have something exciting to behold in their life. They will not be able to know their grandfather like we knew him. They will hear about him through family and friends. They will hear about FLOYD through a thousand different ways.

They will hear about their grandfather from statements in the post office, "Was your grandfather FLOYD SPENCE?" And they will say, "Yes." People will say, "Let me tell a story, how he helped me."

I do not think there is any better legacy than what FLOYD left behind: kindness to everybody, a smile on his face. This body has lost a real gentleman

and a true friend to the men and women who serve in the military.

Mr. Speaker, if we could all be more like FLOYD SPENCE, we would be a better Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I was with FLOYD on his last trip. We flew into Paris to go to the Lafayette Escadrille Memorial, a memorial to recognize 60 Americans in World War I who fought with the French against the Germans. These 60 individuals were killed in France, and they were memorialized at the Lafayette Escadrille, a large memorial. Congressman SPENCE led the delegation, and I gave a speech on their behalf, and he was a strong participant.

I will cherish that trip because that was the last time I spent any time with FLOYD. I think, as pointed out by other speakers, he was a gentleman in the real sense of the word, but he also had a spirit, a spirit of survival, a spiritual makeup that one felt he was in tune with the Lord, and that he continually reminded all of us to appreciate each and every day.

I will miss him when he used to come up on the House floor and say hello. He would always have that kind of expression, and when asked how he was doing, he would respond, I am here and I am very thankful.

When we talk about a person's life, if Members can talk about him with a certain sense of joy, I think that is a positive thing, and I think we are here tonight to say in many ways he brought joy to our lives with his spirit. I am speaking tonight about his accomplishments, but also about his spirit.

Mr. Speaker, I served 10 years on the Committee on Veterans Affairs with him, and in addition to the active military personnel, he was very interested in the retired military, particularly veterans. He was very religious in his attending of subcommittee assignments. I was impressed that he, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, would still have time to come to our Committee on Veterans Affairs, and his participation was very active and commendable considering how much he had on his plate.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that many of us did not see him in his prime athletic years when he was a great athlete. We saw him here with the various replacements he had with his lungs, his kidney, but we did not have the opportunity to see him when he was a strong athlete. He was a leader, a naval officer, and when Members look at the spectrum of his career, it was magnificent and impressive; and when one tops that with his love for the country, it was a perfect package, and I close on that note.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD).

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE was a remarkable individual. He was remarkable for his accomplishments: The fact that he was a steady voice for the national security of this country; the fact that he led the Committee on Armed Services with such great distinction. He was a statesman in the truest sense of the word.

In a way it is not so much all of the things that he did, but his demeanor, the way that he carried himself throughout his efforts that really I think inspires many Members to come to the floor this evening to make commentary on FLOYD.

He came to the chairmanship of the Committee on Armed Services at a time when the majority took over the House, and in a way, the majority was very fortunate to have a leader like him because he was steadfast in his principles, yet he was not personally very polarizing; and as a consequence, he was able to sustain his positions very well and successfully.

Frequently we hear the phrase, kind of a trite phrase, "Courtesy is contagious," but with regard to FLOYD SPENCE, it really was. He was a very kind man. In my personal interactions with him, he always found the time to talk and ask me about how the military was doing in Guam, and what he could do to help us. In that sense, courtesy was contagious. He was the quintessential Southern gentleman. There are still many examples of that around, and we are happy to see that, and I hope it continues to infect the rest of us here who are not from the South.

Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to FLOYD who was my chairman for 6 years. He was a joy to work with, and certainly an inspirational figure in his own way, and it demonstrates that in politics it is not the power of words, but the power of spirit that carries the day. He provided ample evidence of that in his own work.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have very fond memories of FLOYD SPENCE. As a freshman on the Committee on Armed Services looking for direction, he was always there as a friend, and he was willing to give counsel.

I particularly remember when I asked him to come to Fort Riley in my district to visit the soldiers and see the installation and meet the people. As I visit with people back in the district, they still remember him as being very warm, very committed, very sincere, and a great leader.

Mr. Speaker, most people have a birthday every year in their life just to celebrate life, but the one thing that always interested me with Mr. SPENCE was, the Committee on Armed Services had a birthday to celebrate his lungs because he had been given a special gift as a result of complications he had in his life.

My family and I loved him very much. He was always very kind to

them. He was willing to give time whenever he could provide it. He was a man who had known he had been given a great gift from God. He fought for what was right for this country, even if it meant going against Members of his own party because he had that kind of commitment. Debbie was a great contribution to his life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish by saying, Mr. SPENCE, will be missed, and we thank him very much for his great contributions to this great Nation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true champion of freedom from the great State of South Carolina, Congressman FLOYD SPENCE. It was an honor and a personal privilege to serve with FLOYD in Congress. He served his district, his State and his country by fighting for the values that we all cherish. He was a true patriot and a remarkable man.

Congressman SPENCE was recognized around the world as an authority on defense issues. Vice President DICK CHENEY recently said Mr. SPENCE was one of the watchmen over America's security. He had a deep respect for the military, and that respect was returned. He was a patriot who served his country well. FLOYD was chairman emeritus of the Committee on Armed Services, and a senior member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. He was the only Member of Congress to have served as chairman of the Committee on National Security.

A decorated veteran himself, he received many military honors. Most recently, Congressman SPENCE received the 2001 Distinguished Service Award from the Military Order of the World Wars.

FLOYD became a personal friend of mine, and I remember so many occasions on the back of this floor just talking with him. It was his encouragement and sense of humor that gave me a good perspective of our work here: to keep the focus on our country and security and what is best for those who live here. He was an inspiration to me, and I want to honor him tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a champion of freedom from the great state of South Carolina, Congressman FLOYD SPENCE. It was an honor and a personal pleasure to serve with FLOYD in Congress and get to know him over the past few years. He served his district and his country fighting for the values we cherish. He was a true patriot, a remarkable man.

As you know, FLOYD was a walking medical miracle. In 1988, at age 60, he underwent a then rare double-lung transplant. In 1990 when asked to reflect about this operation, FLOYD said "I thank my maker for allowing me to have a second life." This past year he also had a kidney transplant. His doctor characterized FLOYD as a man of extraordinary courage who respected and embraced life. He often said that he was "grateful for any additional day God granted him." Through those experiences, FLOYD continued to serve and became

an active supporter of organ donor awareness programs.

Congressman SPENCE was recognized around the world as an authority on defense issues. Vice President DICK CHENEY recently said SPENCE was one of the "watchmen over America's security." He had a "deep respect for the military, and that respect was returned. He was a patriot who served his country well." FLOYD was the Chairman Emeritus of the Committee on Armed Services and a senior member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He is the only member of Congress to have served as the chairman of the Committee on National Security. A decorated veteran himself, he received many military honors. Most recently, Congressman SPENCE received the 2001 Distinguished Service Award from the Military Order of the World Wars.

Before coming to Congress in 1970, Congressman SPENCE was a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives from 1956-1962 and the South Carolina Senate from 1966-1970. He was a man of faith, a solid conservative, a wise mentor and a shining example of service to myself and the rest of the delegation.

My heart goes out to his wife Debbie and the entire Spence family. Our prayers are with you as you grieve—thank you for sharing such a man of integrity with us.

□ 1930

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor tonight and also join in the eulogy of a friend of the House and a friend of the country. FLOYD SPENCE, I think, was an individual whom many of us here in this body could call a friend, because FLOYD in his aw-shucks kind of Southern gentleman demeanor would come up and ask you how is your health, how are you doing, how is your family, and he always put the needs of others ahead of himself. Even though FLOYD may have been failing in his health, he always wanted to know how you were doing and how you were feeling. That was a lot about who FLOYD was and the impact he had on a lot of us and the impact he left upon a country, because he dedicated his life to public service.

It was truly honorable in the manner in which he conducted not only his everyday life but also his profession. He had so many positive attributes that he could not help but have an impact upon each of us and a nation. I think as an individual that dedicated his efforts to national security and making sure that the men and women who wear the uniform, when they take that uniform off, in his dedicated service to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, he made sure that that solemn oath that that veteran took, that the government in fact fulfilled their commitments to the veterans of this Nation. He taught each of us every day that freedom is not free and that we must be vigilant as a Nation, leaning forward so that we could respond.

FLOYD may not be with us in body but the lives of whom FLOYD SPENCE

touched will be forever with us in spirit. There is a song and the lyrics of that song may have been heard but not listened to by many and it is that life is about more than who we are, it is about what we do with the span of time in which we have. FLOYD embodied that. He made sure that the imprint that he left upon each of us and the Nation was one that was very positive.

FLOYD, to your family, you spoke often of your sons and of your grandchildren, we wish you and your family well. One day we will join you, my friend.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I join my colleagues in bidding a fond farewell to our colleague and "My Chairman," FLOYD SPENCE, who died last month. Our condolences to his wife Deborah and his four children. FLOYD SPENCE was a hero, a patriot, a family man, a man of God, and, above all, a gentleman. In his more than 30 years in this body, he demonstrated civility, respect and kindness toward his colleagues. He was in the finest tradition of Southern gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE served his country honorably in the U.S. Navy, on active duty in the Korean War era, and then as a Reservist, even while a Member of Congress for decades thereafter. His commitment to our troops in uniform was unsurpassed and obvious to those of us who served with him.

In his role as Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee for the six years ending in January, FLOYD really came into his own, in highlighting the deteriorating conditioning of our armed forces and strengthening congressional resolve to address this issue.

I was honored to be in attendance at his funeral, along with Vice President CHENEY, Secretary Rumsfeld and so many others. His voice will be missed in this body, but never forgotten.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, It is with a heavy heart that I stand here today to honor the memory of a dear friend and respected colleague, FLOYD SPENCE. FLOYD was a patriot and a statesman who devoted his 30 years in Congress to securing America's defense and supporting our nation's veterans. As such, he was a well-known voice of experience and leadership on both the House Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs Committees, on which he proudly served for much of his career.

FLOYD assumed the powerful chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee when Republicans gained control of the Congress in 1995. He quickly proved himself a skilled chairman, pushing for and securing billions more in desperately needed defense funding when the Clinton Administration was seeking to gut the military to pay for the massive growth of government social programs. FLOYD helped to save and protect our national defense and laid the groundwork for the current drive to rebuild and redefine our defense capability to better respond to the challenges of the new century battlefield.

Winning tough battles was not uncommon for FLOYD. During his tenure, the gentleman from South Carolina was successful in instituting instrumental legislative initiatives while gaining the admiration and friendship of members from both sides of the aisle.

His quiet strength also got him through some very rough health challenges. Despite these problems, I never heard FLOYD complain. In fact, I can't recall him ever walking into a room without a smile and kind word.

FLOYD was a great American and a personal friend. I greatly value my days serving with him, especially on the Armed Services and VA Committees. He was a source of wisdom and counsel on difficult issues, and his presence in these hallowed halls will be sorely missed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, also on the note earlier echoed by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BUYER, we will miss FLOYD but he has made us all richer.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF THE LATE HONORABLE FLOYD SPENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, August 2, 2001, the Speaker on Tuesday, August 21, 2001, appointed the following Members to attend the funeral of the late Honorable FLOYD SPENCE:

Mr. SPRATT of South Carolina;
Mr. HASTERT of Illinois;
Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma;
Mr. CLYBURN of South Carolina;
Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina;
Mr. DEMINT of South Carolina;
Mr. BROWN of South Carolina;
Mr. YOUNG of Florida;
Mr. HUNTER of California;
Mr. SAXTON of New Jersey;
Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado;
Mr. MCNULTY of New York;
Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland;
Mr. MCHUGH of New York;
Mr. CHAMBLISS of Georgia.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CURRENT IMMIGRATION ISSUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first let me offer my deep appreciation and sympathy, appreciation

for FLOYD SPENCE's life and sympathy to his family.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that we have been expecting new immigration agreements to be announced when the Mexican President, Vicente Fox, visits Washington this week. Instead, we have the White House issuing a statement that they expect a comprehensive U.S.-Mexico immigration reform package in the next 4 to 6 years.

Since their elections last year, both President Fox and President Bush have pressed immigration to the top of their agendas. President Bush has stated that he is willing to embrace a more inclusive vision of America, one that would welcome the talents and contributions of immigrant communities all over this Nation, hardworking, tax-paying immigrants coming from places as far away as Poland, England, Brazil, Guatemala, Singapore and other places that people would be interested in coming to the United States.

It is disappointing that both Presidents believe that reform will take so long to broker. Immigration is extremely complex; however, we cannot delay dealing with the issues involved. The time has come to bring these people out of the shadows and allow them to bask in the sunlight of mainstream American life. The time has come to educate the American people, to make them stakeholders in improving the lives of all Americans and those who access the American dream. Given the momentum the two Presidents have generated up until now and given the expectations, if they do not take advantage at this moment, they will have missed an historic opportunity.

By pushing back a reform in immigration policy, President Bush is losing sight of the millions of hardworking, tax-paying immigrants who have lived in this country for a number of years and have contributed to the economic prosperity of our Nation. What the White House is doing with our immigrant community is nothing more than gesturing, lip service designed to attract badly needed Hispanic support to the Republican fold. We cannot wait 4 to 6 years for real immigration reform. The time has come for a change in U.S. immigration policy.

The Democratic Principles on Immigration provides this necessary immigration reform by rectifying current problems in immigration policy. The principles of the statement are family reunification, earned access to legalization, border safety and protection, enhanced temporary worker program, and ending unfair discrimination against legal immigrants.

A policy based on these five principles will bring stability to the lives of millions of people. In addition to strengthening the national economy, such a policy would honor family values, reward hard work, provide worker protections and enhance civil rights. It would also benefit people who have come to the United States from every corner of the globe. Any new program

to expand the number of guest workers in the U.S. should be considered only after hardworking, tax-paying immigrants already in this country are legalized and it must provide guest workers with full labor and civil rights and a clear path to legalization.

Furthermore, the Statement of Immigration Principles reflects the Democratic Caucus philosophy and core values of family reunification, bringing mothers and fathers together, families with children, fundamental fairness and economic opportunity. Furthermore, the immigration principles stand by the people who fuel the economic engine that drives the American economy and the people who play a vital role in our communities and culture. America's immigrants need redemption for what our Nation's policies have forced them to go through and Americans who are already here need to be recognized that they too need job training and enhanced economic opportunity. We do not separate the immigrant community from our hardworking Americans as well.

We need to empower our immigrant communities so that they can earn a living wage that will help provide for their families. By doing so, we are giving hardworking immigrants the chance to become permanent members of our society rather than continuing to treat them like second-class citizens. If President Bush is serious about immigration policy, I wish to join him as the ranking member on the immigration committee. He needs to remember that immigrants helped build this Nation and that they too are a part of our Nation's prosperity. We must stop the antiimmigration forces in the Republican Party and elsewhere and begin to work together and build America together. Four to six years is absolutely too long.

And if we are to improve our immigration policy, we must restructure the INS, an agency with conflicting priorities and mission overload. Thousands of individuals can attest to the unclear lines of accountability and poor intra-agency communication and coordination and the enormous backlogs. Talk to any Member of Congress and find out how many years and hours and days that they wait in order to access immigration services for their constituents, people who actually want to access legalization and do the right thing. Customers are frustrated. There is no doubt that the INS needs to be restructured because it lacks good customer service.

I have introduced the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 2001, H.R. 1562, which includes the objectives of improving accountability and performance. It creates a proper balance between enforcement and services. To achieve the goal of restructuring and reorganizing the immigration function fairly, effectively and efficiently, H.R. 1562 replaces the current INS with two new and clear subordinate entities, one for immigration

services and one for law enforcement, within one agency. H.R. 1562 separates the enforcement and service functions of the INS into the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement. Services and enforcement would have separate and clear lines of authority at all levels, from field to headquarters, so current INS regional and district offices would be eliminated and replaced with separate networks of immigration services and enforcement area local offices.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, as I close, let me simply say, we have got to address this question head-on, help our hardworking immigrants, and restructure the INS. That is a real policy. I ask for President Fox and President Bush to ensure that we work together.

There is no question that we have been expecting new immigration agreements to be announced when the Mexican President, Vicente Fox, visits Washington this week. Instead, we have the White House issuing a statement that they expect a comprehensive U.S.-Mexico immigration reform package in the next four to six years.

Since their elections last year, Fox and Bush have pressed immigration to the top of their agendas. President Bush has stated that he is willing to embrace a more inclusive vision of America, one that would welcome the talents and contributions of immigrant communities.

It is disappointing that both Presidents believe that reform will take so long to broker. Immigration is extremely complex; however we cannot delay dealing with the issues involved. The time has come to bring these people out of the shadows and allow them to bask in the sunlight of mainstream American life. Given the momentum the two presidents have generated up until now, and given the expectations, if they don't take advantage at this moment, they will have missed an historic opportunity.

By pushing back a reform in immigration policy, President Bush is losing sight of the millions of hardworking, tax paying immigrants who have lived in this country for a number of years and have contributed to the economic prosperity of our nation.

What the White House is doing with our immigrant community is nothing more than gesturing—lip service designed to attract badly-needed Hispanic support to the Republican fold.

We cannot wait four to six years for real immigration reform. The time has come for a change in U.S. immigration policy.

The Democratic Principles on Immigration provides this necessary immigration reform by rectifying current problems in immigration policy. The main principles of the Statement are family reunification, earned access to legalization, border safety and protection, enhanced temporary worker program, and ending unfair discrimination against legal immigrants.

A policy based on these five principles would bring stability to the lives of millions of people. In addition to strengthening the national economy, such a policy would honor family values; reward hard work; provide worker protections; and enhance civil rights. It would also benefit people who have come to the U.S. from every corner of the globe.

Any new program to expand the number of guest workers in the U.S. should be consid-

ered only after hard working, tax-paying immigrants already in this country are legalized—and it must provide guest workers with full labor and civil rights and a clear path to legalization.

Furthermore, the Statement of Immigration Principles reflects the Democratic Caucus philosophy and core values of family reunification, fundamental fairness and economic opportunity. Furthermore, the immigration principles stand by the people who fuel the economic engine that drives the American economy and the people that play a vital role in our communities and culture. America's immigrants need redemption for what our nation's policies has forced them to go through.

We need to empower our immigrant communities so they can earn a living wage that will help provide for their families. By doing so, we are giving hard-working immigrants the chance to become permanent members of our society rather than continuing to treat them like second class citizens.

If President Bush is serious about immigration policy, he needs to remember that immigrants helped build this nation and that they too are a part of our nation's prosperity. The anti-immigration forces in the Republican Party should not dictate the future of millions of hard-working men and women seeking better opportunities.

We cannot wait four to six years to lead to a positive, fair and meaningful difference in the lives of these millions of hard-working families is too long. Current immigration policies must be recrafted as soon as possible to reflect our core values of family unity, fundamental fairness, and economic opportunity. Consequently, the Democrats will fortunate the Statement of Immigration Principles into legislation.

In addition to reforming our immigration policy, Congress must address the much needed restructuring of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Despite the fact that INS has experienced a significant expansion in its budget and staff, the Agency continues to be the most mismanaged agency in the US government.

INS is an agency with conflicting priorities and mission overload. Thousands of individuals can attest to the exacerbation of unclear lines of accountability and poor intra-agency communications and coordination. One result has been for the Agency to allow lengthy backlogs to develop for processing matters such as citizenship applications, visas, and a host of other immigration benefits.

There are accounts of delayed cases that cause two and three fingerprint clearances, lost files, mistaken information on the computer that causes INS to believe that a person is naturalized when they are not. Others account extreme delays in inputting fingerprint clearances in the computer so that applicants can be interviewed and delays in Service Centers sending files to District Offices. Unbelievable to many is the fact that INS sends receipts to inform applicants of the time frame which their application should be adjudicated; however, these time frames are frequently, if not almost always, wrong.

Furthermore, the Agency lacks good customer service. Many INS offices around the country are understaffed and the staff is inefficient and mismanaged. In addition, there is an obvious lack of training that most employees receive.

There is no end to the frustration felt by customers.

There is no doubt that INS needs to be restructured. The INS must dedicate itself to changing the manner in which it addresses the needs of people who require, deserve and pay for—in the form of fees and taxes—the services that it is charged with fulfilling.

What remains in question is when will we restructure INS and how will we restructure the agency? The first question has a simple response. Restructuring is long overdue. We need to commence restructuring immediately.

As ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, I have introduced legislation of how INS should be restructured. This legislation, the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 2001 (H.R. 1562), includes the objectives of improving accountability and performance. Furthermore, it creates a proper balance between enforcement and services. It also provides an effective way to direct, coordinate, and integrate enforcement and service functions.

To achieve the goal of restructuring and reorganizing the immigration function fairly, effectively, and efficiently, H.R. 1562 replaces the current INS with two new and clear subordinate entities—one for immigration services and one for law enforcement—within one agency. H.R. 1562 separates the enforcement and service functions of INS into the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement. Services and enforcement would have separate and clear lines of authority at all levels, from the field to headquarters. So current INS regional and district offices would be eliminated and replaced with separate networks of immigration services and enforcement area local offices. Not only will restructuring in this manner enhance enforcement of the Nation's immigration laws and improve the delivery of services, but it will greatly improve the ability of the INS to perform its duties effectively and efficiently and will increase accountability.

In addition, a strong, centralized leadership for immigration policy-making and implementation would be created. This position would be within the Department of Justice and called the Associate Attorney General for Immigration Affairs. This single voice is needed at the top to coordinate policy matters and interpret complex laws in both enforcement and adjudications, so as to ensure accountability and effective implementation.

The single executive would report to the Attorney General and be responsible for (1) integrating immigration policy and management operations within the Department of Justice, (including coordinating policy-making and planning between offices so as to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness that result from shared infrastructure and unified implementation of the law); (2) maintaining the crucial balance between enforcement and services; and (3) ensuring a coherent national immigration policy. It is crucial that a single, high-level Department official speak for the Executive branch on matters involving immigration policy and that this official have the authority to direct and manage our immigration system to ensure that immigration policy and management is fully integrated and coordinated.

H.R. 1562 also mandates that immigration enforcement and services functions must be supported by a set of shared services, including records, technology, training, and other management functions.

Finally, it is important that the service/adjudication as well as the enforcement function is fully funded. All offices need to have stable and predictable sources of funding. Appropriated funds must supplement user fees so as to improve customer service, offset the costs of those adjudications for which no fees are charged, and fund all costs not directly related to the adjudication of fee based applications.

I urge my United States House of Representative colleagues adopt this legislation. The INS desperately needs restructuring. We must continue to fight to solicit not only promises of better services from the INS, but actual, better service. We must compel the agency to redouble its efforts to assist immigrants rather than simply increase the fees that it imposes on its customers.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk for just a couple of minutes following the eulogy and the little memorial discussion that we had with respect to our old friend FLOYD SPENCE who really represented the idea that you needed to have a strong national defense to maintain all of our other freedoms and who dedicated his career as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and ultimately the chairman of the committee to national defense.

I thought that the best service we could render to FLOYD right now would be to remind our colleagues that we still have a lot of work to do with respect to national defense. We are still short on ammunition, measurably short. We are \$3 billion short in terms of the Army's requirements and several hundred million dollars short with respect to the Marine Corps. We are still vastly short on ammunition. Spare parts, we have now cannibalization taking place across the array of front line aircraft, the front line fighter. I am talking about F-15s, F-15Es and F-16s. Their mission-capable rates are dropping off the cliff, meaning that they now are not as ready as they used to be to be able to go out and do their mission and come back.

We still have personnel problems. We are still some 800-plus pilots short in the United States Air Force and across the services. We have lots of personnel shortages.

□ 1945

So we have a need, Mr. Speaker, to spend about an additional \$50 billion per year on top of what we are spending right now. I would remind my colleagues we are spending roughly \$125 billion a year less than the Reagan administration did in the mid-1980s in real dollars.

So I think that the best service we can do to FLOYD's memory is to carry the flag that he carried, which is to remind our colleagues that we need to preserve a strong national defense.

I would yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), a good friend, a former member of the Committee on Armed Services, a veteran, and a veteran of the Gulf War, and a person who believes in defense.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

When the gentleman comes up with his \$50 billion number, what he did not mention, and I ask him to elaborate a little built, is on the question of deferred maintenance. When one looks at this past decade of the 1990s, in the post-Reagan buildup, we began to use a lot of the equipment, use those maintenance facilities, and now the bill is coming due, is it not?

Mr. HUNTER. That is absolutely right. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is going to speak later on on this trip that he took across the bases in this country and reviewing all of the deferred maintenance, the potholes on the runways, the repair on aircraft, but also the infrastructure maintenance, just keeping our buildings in good shape, keeping military housing in good shape.

When we would have to go to a mission, let us say to a Bosnia or another place, another operations area, instead of the administration, then the Clinton administration, asking for more money from Congress, they would simply reach into the cash register and take out money that was going to be used for maintenance.

So having used that money and not replaced it, when the services looked for money to be able to repair their old buildings, repair their runways, furnish spare parts, it was not there.

Mr. BUYER. When I look back now at the 1990s, I say as Congress sought to react to some of the personnel problems, we repealed the reduction, we reformed the retirement system, we made reforms in the pay tables, we increased military pay, we addressed the health care, we addressed the food stamp issue, so we focused a lot on personnel and people.

Now we need to focus on all that deferred maintenance that is going to come crashing down upon us. And shame on us if we do not focus on it, because the gentleman is absolutely right, it is the water lines, it is the pipes, it is the roofs, it is the equipment, it is the automobiles, and the list goes on and on. I am most hopeful that it is something that the administration will be leaning forward on.

Mr. HUNTER. I hope the administration works with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction in the Committee on Armed Services to come up with some new ways to buy military housing for military families, because, as the gentleman knows, a lot of that housing is 20, 30, 40, 50 years old; and in a lot of places around the country our young families do not have housing available on the bases. There is not housing. They have to go out on the economy,

and in places like San Diego you are looking at \$1,000, \$1,200 a month for the smallest amounts. So we have some major problems to fix, and that means money.

Mr. BUYER. The gentleman is bringing a defense bill to the floor next week. What are the major themes of that defense bill?

Mr. HUNTER. We are going to try to do a lot of things with what we have, with the \$18 billion in extra spending that we anticipate this year above and beyond what we call the "Clinton baseline." But that \$18 billion, once again, does not come close to solving the equipment problem, which is about a \$30-billion-per-year problem, solving the ammunition problems, the people problems, the other problems we have across the board. We are going to do as much as we can.

CRITICAL ISSUES AFFECTING WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KIRK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I have come tonight to reflect upon some of the issues that I was confronted with over this August recess with many women whom I spoke with, and they simply wanted to know what we were doing in this House and this administration in trying to address some of the critical issues that are affecting women today. As we know, the women of today and tomorrow will be the majority of the workforce and thereby need to have the necessary tools with which they can provide for their families and themselves.

As I talked with these women, they were really concerned about reproductive rights. They want to make sure that this House does not whittle away the rights that they should have to look into whether they will provide for their children, whether they will have the right to their own lives, to their own bodies; and they simply want to make sure that this House does not do anything that would be destructive to the rights of women in terms of their reproductive rights.

Domestic violence is another one that they have talked with me about, because they simply look at the number of women and children who are now on the streets, the streets across this Nation, the most powerful Nation on Earth, not giving the women, again, tools to provide for their families and themselves, giving them the job training that they need so that they can sustain themselves and their families, giving their children the type of education that is needed to provide them the type of future that is required for the workforce.

Mr. Speaker, we must simply look at the agenda that this Congress is bringing forth for women and their families, as well as this administration. We can

really leave no family behind, as we talk about leaving no child behind.

So as I come tonight, I just want the American people to know that I will be here every week now trying to synthesize and look through the myriad of issues that we have here on this floor, to see whether or not we really are serious about leaving no child behind and ensuring that the women of today will be sufficiently prepared for the workforce tomorrow and for today.

So beginning this month-long effort, we want to look at the wellness of women and their families. We want to look into the public policy to find out whether or not this administration is serious about leaving no child behind. As we look at that, we simply look at the education proposal that has been put forth.

We do not have the money to talk about the class sizes that the urban areas and the rural areas look at in terms of their children's quality of health and quality of education. This budget does not speak to reducing class sizes. It does not speak to qualified teachers that will be teachers who are making the salary conducive to teaching our children. It does not speak to the construction of schools that will provide the proper type of environment for our children.

This education proposal that the President has put through will leave children behind if he does not put the type of financial support behind these words and this slogan. It will be an empty slogan if the money does not follow the message.

So if we are talking about leaving no child behind, especially in my district of Watts and Compton and Wilmington, where you have the most impoverished kids, you have to make sure title I has the type of funding that is necessary to bring these children forward, the type of classrooms that will teach them high technology, the type of qualified teachers that will be there to teach them and to have a type of constructive engagement that will help them through their period of schooling. Healthy Start and Head Start need to have financial support.

I will be looking very carefully at this education proposal, looking at the President when he speaks about leaving no child behind, to make sure that we have sufficient funding for math and science for girls, because as I have gone around this Nation over this last month, I have found that there is a considerably decreasing number of girls in math and science classes. We are not encouraging our girls to go into math and science, and yet these are the future engineers and scientists who will be speaking to and doing research on the quality of life for families. So that is one element that we need to look at. The other thing is that of health.

Mr. Speaker, I will simply say, I will be here every week to speak on health, education and the quality of life for women and their families.

FOREIGN POLICY AND OUR NATIONAL SECURITY OBJECTIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, earlier the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I spoke on the issues of national security. I want to touch on an issue we do not really talk about much on the House floor, and it is the issue of foreign policy and how it relates to our national security objectives, i.e., our military strategy to fight and win our Nation's wars, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) likes to refer to, with overwhelming force.

We went through the 8 years of the Clinton administration and we had a foreign policy of engagement. The President has the responsibility of outlining what are the vital interests of a Nation. Then he turns to the Pentagon and says what is your military strategy now to protect the interests of a Nation that I have outlined?

President Clinton, what he had done in his foreign policy of engagement, took 275,000 of America's finest and spread them over 135 nations all around the world. What that did was create an expectancy by our allies and our friends that the United States will always be there. So when you looked at Germany, or the United Kingdom, other allies began to decrease their defense budgets relative to their GNP.

Time out. You are going the wrong way. So now we have had a change in administrations and a change in direction, so I give some counsel now unto the administration: when the United States has provided for the peace and the stability of two major regions of the world, the Pacific Rim and Europe, I believe the United States as a superpower, we can act. Whether it is unilaterally or in concert with another nation, if there is instability upon a region of the world, then we can act.

Take, for example, the continent of Europe. If there is an intercontinental conflict that poses no threat to destabilize the region, then our allies need to step up to the plate. We can provide assistance through our architecture of intelligence or through our airlift and our sealift, but we need to ask of our allies that they begin to accept greater burdens of peace and responsibility.

Now to the issue of our military force structure and how that relates to that foreign policy. There is a debate in the town about do we move away from the military strategy of being able to fight and win two nearly simultaneous major regional conflicts. I have never endorsed that two-major-regional-conflict scenario, but I think what is important and what I have heard the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) say is it is in our interests, this Nation of ours, to not only protect our interests and that of our allies; when they need our assistance, we need to be

highly mobile and volatile. I mean, it has to be lethal. It has to be a force that can respond rapidly.

So we can have debates, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), I want to yield to him, to speak about the discussions he is presently having on the Committee on Armed Services about what should be the proper force structure as we move to the 21st century.

Mr. HUNTER. I am glad the gentleman is speaking today, because he is one of our Desert Storm veterans and was over in the Gulf and watched what then was an overwhelming use of force against Saddam Hussein. I believe you have to be prepared. I think "be prepared" is the key position that the U.S. should take, because if you look at the forces that we used against Saddam Hussein, many of those forces came out of Europe.

Those were forces that were lined up initially in Germany and other parts of Europe to offset what we thought then would be a conflict perhaps with the Warsaw Pact, that is, with Russians and Russian allies, the Soviet Union.

But that did not happen. In the end, we moved those forces into that theater in the Middle East, and we used them with devastating effect against Saddam Hussein's own military, which was much touted as the fourth largest army in the world.

So I think the lesson there is that unusual things happen. If we had gone back over the last century and the 619,000 Americans who died in the 20th century in conflicts, most of those conflicts arose in ways that we in no way anticipated, whether it was December 7, 1941, or this last event with Saddam Hussein invading Kuwait.

The gentleman and I sat there on the Committee on Armed Services and asked our intelligence people, Which of you anticipated this invasion of Kuwait? One of the gentleman actually said, Before or after the armor started moving? We said, No, before. And none of them had anticipated it.

So the key here is to be prepared. If you have force, you can move it, just as we did the forces out of Europe. If you have the air power, you can move it around the world. That is what that gentleman illustrated when he fought in Desert Storm.

□ 2000

THE EFFECTS OF HEART DISEASE AND CANCER ON AMERICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to bring attention to the threat that heart disease and cancer pose to the health of American women. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD)

for organizing the Special Orders on women's health issues this evening and all during this month. As a nurse, I have made access to quality health care one of my highest priorities in Congress. I am particularly interested in making sure that there is equity in the access to health care between men and women.

Certain diseases and conditions are more prevalent in women than in men, and certain diseases and conditions affect women differently. Often health care professionals and women themselves do not give these conditions and diseases the attention they need. Heart disease and stroke are perfect examples of this fact. Over half of all deaths from heart disease and stroke occur in women. That is over half.

More women die from heart disease each year than from breast, ovarian and uterine cancer combined, making heart disease the number one cause of mortality in women. But heart disease is usually believed to predominantly affect men.

As cochair of the Congressional Heart and Stroke Coalition, I have worked closely with the American Heart Association and the American Red Cross to raise awareness about cardiovascular disease and stroke. While women and minorities bear a major portion of the cardiovascular disease burden, they are often unaware of its life-threatening symptoms and are diagnosed at later stages of the disease, and they may not receive appropriate medical care or follow-up services. Addressing risk factors such as elevated cholesterol, high blood pressure, obesity, physical inactivity and smoking will greatly reduce women's risk of disability and death from cardiovascular disease.

Congress needs to do its part to make sure that doctors, patients and all Americans are educated about the symptoms and dangers that women face and all Americans face from heart disease and stroke. Very soon, I will introduce the Stroke Treatment and Ongoing Prevention Act, or STOP Stroke Act, in the House, so that we can raise public awareness of the disease and its symptoms.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to highlight now a few of the initiatives that address cancer treatment and research. Along with heart disease and stroke, cancer is a serious threat to women's health. As a member of the House Cancer Caucus, I joined with 44 of my colleagues to write to HHS Secretary Tommy Thompson to express our support for expanded Medicare coverage of positron emission topography, or PET scan, for women's health. PET is a powerful clinical tool that can assist health care providers in making life-saving diagnoses and determining the most effective treatment for women with breast, ovarian, uterine and cervical cancers. I am hopeful that Secretary Thompson will support this effort.

In addition, I am a proud cosponsor of the bill authored by the gentle-

woman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), which would require minimum hospital stays for women after mastectomies. In addition, I cosponsored two other initiatives this year relating to breast cancer funding and research.

The Breast Cancer Research Stamp Act extends the Breast Cancer Research semipostal stamp through the year 2008, and the Breast Cancer and Environmental Research Act studies the links between environmental factors and breast cancer. It is so important to keep in mind that increased research on these and other women's health concerns can and surely will improve the quality and length of our lives. For all of these reasons, we must continue to work together in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that women's health remains a high priority on the congressional agenda.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to hearing from my colleagues in the Women's Caucus as the days go by on these and other issues that pertain to women's health.

HIV/AIDS IN AMERICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I too come to the floor this evening to discuss a serious women's issue at a time when the women in the House are focused, as we approach the end of the session, on health issues. I want to remind the House that it is time to get serious about HIV and AIDS in women in the United States.

I have come to the floor with shocking statistics about AIDS worldwide where 50 percent of those with AIDS are women and, in Africa and Asia, whole continents are being engulfed with the disease. But we have not done our work here, and so with this emphasis this evening on health, I want to focus on preventing a preventable disease in women. What began as a so-called homosexual disease, we have quickly found out was a universal disease. But we have not targeted information and education about AIDS in women as a women's disease, and that is what this is.

There are two groups of women we need to focus on especially, very young women and women of color, because that is where the epidemic is. Among very young women between 13 and 24, half of the reported cases are women, 49 percent. And women of color, black and Hispanic women, are only a quarter of the population, but they are three-quarters of the AIDS cases. This is a wake-up call, I say to my colleagues.

What to do? First, we have not reached many women once. We have had better luck reaching men, because

we have targeted them. After we reach them once, we had better reach them every 3 or 4 years, because as a whole new group of young women and young men, they never got reached in the first place, because they were too young. That is the way this sexually transmitted disease works. If they only knew. It is what they do not know that will hurt them.

Forty percent of women are infected through a partner. They do not know that what the partner does with bring home the disease. Twenty-seven percent are infected through needles. If they only knew. If they only knew that if they press their communities to have programs that are explicit about this disease in shelters for runaways, in youth detention centers, in schools, we could begin to reach girls. This is where the young women are. This is where the women of color are.

What can we do in this House? Let us hasten the science on the female condom. It is time women took control of preventing this disease, and the female condom, with NIH working much more aggressively on it, would be one way. Microbicides that a woman can use quickly to destroy the virus before it takes hold, and combination antiretroviral therapies that can reduce the risk to newborns. Only 5 percent of newborns get the disease by transmission from the mother if women have access to these therapies.

Mr. Speaker, it costs \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year to take those pills after one gets the disease. We are talking about a disease that women do not have to get in the first place. We have not targeted them. First, we targeted homosexuals. That was wrong. We should have targeted the whole population, but we had some success targeting homosexuals, although that group is beginning to get the disease again.

Then we targeted men generally. We have targeted people of color without being very specific about who they are.

The fact is that nobody has targeted women of color, nobody is targeting very young women where the disease is spreading like wildfire and where the very young are quickly becoming half, half of all of those with the AIDS/HIV virus.

We come to the floor talking about diseases that we want more science about. We want more science about this. But most of the diseases we talk about, we cannot prevent. What makes this so heartbreaking is that we can prevent it. What makes it especially heartbreaking as to women is that they pass the disease on to their children.

We have not begun to work to prevent AIDS in women as we have in men. We have not begun to tell them the whole story. We who talk about sex all the time do not talk about the kind of sex that can kill people. It is time that we took a hold of this disease, as we can, especially as it now begins to spread and become a disease among the young where half of those getting it are women.

TRIBUTE TO SANDI HANSEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Sandi Hansen who passed away on Sunday, August 26 at the age of 26. Sandi Hansen was a dear friend of Oregon who contributed passion and energy to the livability of the greater Portland metropolitan region. Throughout her career, Sandi kept her eye toward the future and worked to make our collective community one to be treasured by generations to come.

Sandi spent much of her career teaching school at Humboldt Grade School and Ockley Green Middle School in North Portland. She was active in the Overlook Neighborhood Association and a strong supporter of the Peninsula Trail, a key component of the citywide network of biking and hiking trails.

From 1990 to 1994, Sandi served as a Metro counselor at a time when Metro developed a 50-year growth guideline for the 24 cities and portions of three counties encompassed by the urban growth boundary. After the council approved the guidelines in December 1994, she said, "It is a little bit like looking back on Rome." Those guidelines now serve to shape the growth of our communities for the next 45 years in a responsible and reflective manner and have been lauded nationwide.

Sandi Hansen, a true community leader, made a difference for all of us. Sandi Hansen: friend, teacher, mother, and wife. Because of her commitment to our community and our State, we are all better off because of her. My condolences go to her family. Sandi Hansen will be sorely missed by all that knew her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE MEMORY OF F. DANIEL MOLONEY, SR., A GREAT PUBLIC HERO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GRUCCI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRUCCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise with a heavy heart to honor the memory of a great public hero and a great public official, private businessman and com-

munity leader, and a dear friend from my hometown of Brookhaven, Long Island. F. Daniel Moloney passed away Sunday, August 26, 2001, at the age of 63 after a long battle with cancer.

Dan Moloney was known for his dedication and service to the community where he served with dignity and integrity as the Town of Brookhaven's receiver of taxes for the past 22 years, as a commissioner for 20 years of the Ronkonkoma Fire Department, and as the founder of Moloney Funeral Homes, the largest independent funeral homes on Long Island.

Francis Daniel Moloney was born in Bay Shore on December 22, 1937, to James J. Moloney of Limerick, Ireland, and Mary Lowe Moloney of Central Islip. After graduating from Villanova University, he did graduate work at C.W. Post College and attended the American Academy-McAllister Institute. He earned his nursing home administrator's license and was a New York State licensed funeral director.

With only \$24 in the bank and working as a substitute teacher in the Brentwood and Centereach school districts and a midnight shift at the Central Islip state hospital in order to support his family, in 1962, Dan Moloney founded the Moloney Funeral Homes in Lake Ronkonkoma. That business grew into the largest independent funeral home on Long Island with five different branches across the island.

Through all of his business growth and successful battles in fighting off larger corporations that bought out so many local funeral homes, Dan was always proud that he remained a small family business. Today, the fourth generation of his family continues to work in the business he founded.

Dan always had the passion to serve his community. In addition to volunteering for his local fire department, Dan was a member of the Knights of Columbus, the Loyal Order of the Moose, the Smittown Elks, the Ronkonkoma Chamber of Commerce, the Ronkonkoma Historical Society, and the Order of Sons of Italy Guy Lombardo Lodge.

□ 2015

He also served on the Board of Directors of the St. Charles Hospital in Port Jefferson, and was a past President of the National Association of Approved Morticians.

Dan's activism and commitment to his community led him into public service. He was elected as the receiver of taxes for the town of Brookhaven in 1979, where he provided strong leadership in local government for 22 years.

Dan Moloney also had a love for adventure and the great outdoors. In addition to being an avid skier, boater, and golfer, he was proud that at the age of 50 he rode a bicycle the 480 miles from San Francisco to Los Angeles. Dan also hiked the 14,000-foot mountain ranges of Colorado, including Pike's Peak and Mount Quandry. He also loved participating in cattle drives.

Dan Moloney was one of those rare individuals that took seriously his role as a member of the community, instead of viewing himself as an individual. He took pleasure and pride in helping and serving others, and he enjoyed life to the fullest. Not just the citizens and taxpayers of the town of Brookhaven, but all of us who call Long Island our home, will sorely miss F. Daniel Moloney.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my condolences and that of the First Congressional District to his mother, Mary; long-time companion and friend, Cheryl Tully; his children: F. Daniel, Junior; Virginia Wagenknecht, Michael S., Kathleen Anderson, Peter G., Thomas E., Christine Lentz, and Melissa Moloney; his brothers, Jack and the late James; his daughters-in-law: Denise, Jacqueline, Abbie, and Christine; his sons-in-law: James Lentz and John Anderson; and his 17 grandchildren.

Goodnight, my friend. Sleep well. The world will be a sore place without you.

REGARDING VISIT OF PRESIDENT BUSH AND PRESIDENT OF MEXICO VICENTE FOX TO TOLEDO, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to include for the RECORD a letter that was sent today by myself to both President Bush and President Fox of Mexico.

Tomorrow will be an historic day here in this Chamber as we welcome the President of Mexico, Vicente Fox, to hear his remarks as the new President of Mexico. Following that address, both Presidents will then travel to our home district, the Ninth District of Ohio, the greater Toledo area.

With respect to their visit, we certainly want to extend an official welcome to both Presidents on their historic journey, and we look forward to their visit and to their remarks.

We also hope that both Presidents will listen and learn as our citizenry attempts to draw them into a dialogue about the conditions of workers and education in our region, and other concerns on the minds of our citizens.

We hope that, building on this trip, more important than any single day would be a request that we are sending to both Presidents to establish a working relationship between their administrations in the form of an intercontinental organization on working life and cooperation in the Americas, to actually set up a means by which we could deal with some of the unintended economic and social consequences of NAFTA in both nations.

The serious dislocation of millions of industrial and agricultural workers, as well as small- and medium-sized firms, demands serious and compassionate ac-

tion by those sworn to serve their fellow citizens.

In our own region of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, since NAFTA well over 115,000 more good-paying jobs have been lost to the maquiladora zone, where workers in that region toil for hunger wages and have no job security.

Ohio is among the top five States losing jobs to NAFTA, and nationally, since NAFTA, over 776,000 middle-class jobs have been relocated to the maquiladora zone.

Most recently, Phillips Electronics in Ottawa, Ohio, where we hope both Presidents will ultimately visit, is the latest plant that has announced its shutdown of large portions of production, terminating hundreds and hundreds of middle-class workers, those jobs going to Mexico.

Spangler's Candy in Bryan, Ohio, announced it will shift its candy cane line production to Mexico.

Last week in Chicago, Brach's Candy, employing 1,500 people, with a major segment of Latino-American workers, announced it is shutting down its centuries-old factory there and moving production south to Mexico, or possibly Argentina.

The displacement of high-paying middle-class manufacturing jobs across our country is fueled by NAFTA, and will only worsen if the proposed Free Trade Agreement of the Americas ignores the plight of workers. This is why we are pleading with both Presidents to set up a formal mechanism that intercontinentally deals with these serious distortions in our labor markets.

There are 3,200 firms in the maquiladora zone, and most of those employ largely women workers, have no freely-lected labor representation, no job security, and people work in high-productivity poverty.

The U.S.-Mexico border, meanwhile, is plagued more and more by alarming rates of tuberculosis on both sides, sewage effluent flowing into drinking water, moot environmental laws, and crumbling infrastructure that cannot bear the load being placed on it.

The root causes of the illegal immigration crisis in our country lie in deep and continuing disparity between the compensation and living standards of workers on either side of the border. Our continent needs a common minimum wage and common labor standards and common environmental laws that are enforced.

The chart that I have here this evening gives some sense of what has happened to the United States since NAFTA's passage. Prior to NAFTA's passage, we had a favorable trade balance with Mexico, which means that we were exporting more there than importing.

Since that time, what has happened is we have been racking up historic deficits with Mexico, and in fact, Mexico has become the export platform that we predicted. What the trade deficit translates into are thousands and

thousands of lost jobs from our country, and the exports that go down there actually U-turn. They come back to us in the form of finished goods.

But the wages of the people in Mexico have actually gone down since NAFTA, and our wages have been stuck in this country for well over a decade.

In the countryside in Mexico, over 30 million farm families have been removed from their land simply because the trade agreement provides no soft landing for people who have eked out a living on their small ajita lands.

These people are moving across our continent. Hundreds and hundreds are literally dying, some at our border, some inside our country. We simply must have a task force on this international, intercontinental organization that I am proposing to deal with this agricultural issue.

Mr. Speaker, we will invite both Presidents to travel with us to the sites that I am talking about in both the United States and Mexico.

I include for the RECORD the formal letter we have sent to both of them, along with an article from today's Los Angeles Times entitled "Toledo's Plea to Presidents Bush and Fox: Don't let trade cost jobs."

The material referred to is as follows:

TOLEDO'S PLEA TO BUSH, FOX: DON'T LET
TRADE COST JOBS

(By Megan Garvey)

TOLEDO, OHIO.—Even as President Bush and Mexican President Vicente Fox prepare to visit this industrial city known for strong unions, ethnic neighborhoods and fierce opposition to free trade, unemployment checks will be going out to workers laid off at the Jeep plant.

Bush plans to come here Thursday to tout his commitment to helping Mexican immigrants pursue the American dream and, the White House says, "again commemorate the very important role that Mexicans and Hispanic Americans play in our American culture."

With a Mexican American community that dates to the 1930s, not many in Toledo have a problem with that.

They just think that it's beside the point.

The point—what concerns Toledo's white majority, its sizable Mexican American population and even many of the undocumented workers who harvest northwestern Ohio's tomato and cucumber crops each year—is not immigration or culture.

It's jobs.

To many in this gritty Great Lakes port on the southwest tip of Lake Erie, free trade means the flight of jobs to low-wage places like Mexico. And although the U.S. industrial heartland has prospered in the years since the U.S.-Mexico border was opened through the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994, Bush and Fox have chosen a dicey time to come to Toledo: The manufacturing recession that began about a year ago is taking its toll here.

And Ohio is losing jobs as companies move to Mexico for its cheap, nonunion labor—from a Mr. Coffee plant that lost about 320 jobs, to Amana's kitchen range plant where almost 645 more positions disappeared. Then there is DaimlerChrysler's Jeep plant, where union workers who thought they had guaranteed jobs are being laid off, even as the company spends \$300 million to expand its Toluca, Mexico, plant to meet demand for the popular PT Cruiser.

"It's not about race or ethnicity," said Toledo native Marcy Kaptur, a Democrat who has represented the area in Congress for more than two decades. "We're beyond all that. It's about economics."

Toledo officials, who bill their town as "A Renaissance City," have fought hard to keep jobs, cutting deals to entice new auto industry investment and pushing for a riverfront development zone, which is up for a vote.

Still, economic projections for the state and region show job growth mainly in low-paying service industry jobs. Manufacturing employment, long Toledo's backbone, has declined. And like other Rust Belt cities, the decline in high-paying manufacturing jobs translates into declining population: The city of Toledo has lost more than 20,000 residents since 1990, according to the most recent census figures.

While many here blame NAFTA, free-trade proponents point to figures that show Ohio's exports to Mexico have risen from \$709 million annually to nearly \$2 billion in the years since the pact was concluded.

EVEN MIGRANTS ARE LOSING WORK TO MEXICO

At Tony Packo's Cafe, a Hungarian place on Toledo's east side that makes it own hot dogs, the regulars say much the same thing.

"There is no doubt in anyone's mind here that free trade has cost good jobs. No doubt," says Ken Oehlert, 59, a retired teacher who grew up in the Old North End.

More surprising, perhaps, is that some of the migrant Mexican farm workers who gather tomatoes in the wide, flat field south of town for Heinz tomato paste, or cucumbers for the Vlasic pickle plant, echo that view.

Wages are so low south of the border, pickers say, that tomato-growing operations long based in the United States are shifting to Mexico. So migrant workers who come to the U.S. are losing out to Mexican workers back home.

In Toledo, local pride is important. Tony Packo's hot dogs, a visitor quickly learns, were the favorites of the cross-dressing Cpl. Klinger of "MASH" fame.

There is similar pride in the city's historical role in building cars—pride now mingled with a sense of betrayal. Workers think the new economy has not played fair with them, that it has not abided by its own rules.

DaimlerChrysler's decision to eliminate 1,500 jobs when it stopped manufacturing the Jeep Cherokee caught many local politicians and United Auto Workers leaders by surprise.

A few years before, the city went to great expense to persuade the auto maker to build a plant here to make the Cherokee's replacement, the Jeep Liberty. The deal came with massive tax breaks and other inducements, and, the people of Toledo believed, the promise to keep 5,000 union jobs in town.

But shortly after the Liberty plant opened, the Cherokee workers were laid off, rather than moved to other lines or given their own line converted for another vehicle.

What particularly galls locals is the fact that those jobs were cut even as the company has had trouble keeping up with demand for its retro-style PT Cruiser. The Cruiser's transmissions are made in Toledo, but the car is assembled in Mexico.

"We had a line shut down here that put more than 1,000 people out of work," said Larry Jamra, 58, a business owner who counts himself as one of the relatively few Toledo voters who supported the Republican ticket in the last presidential election. "But that's NAFTA—it put every business in a position of knowing they could do things for half the price in Mexico, and that's just good business."

Jamra grew up with Oehlert, the retired teacher, who says most people in Toledo

aren't mad at Mexicans about what's happened. They're furious with the corporations.

"We don't see the standard of living being raised in Mexico," Oehlert said, "And wasn't that part of the point of free trade?"

Juan Perez Quiroz, a 48-year-old Mexican working on Toledo's rural outskirts, reflects what Oehlert and others see as the problem: Wages remain so low in Mexico, despite free trade, that coming north still pays, even for a low-wage field hand.

What's worse, even itinerant farm workers like Quiroz apparently are being undercut by desperate workers back home.

Midday in the August heat, Quiroz stands idle in a tomato packing shed.

When the pickers reported for duty at first light, the current crop was judged too small, and most were sent back to the camps for a forced day off; no pay.

Quiroz shrugs it off, having learned in the five years he has been making the trip north from his home in Mexico that this sometimes happens. College-educated, a retired agricultural engineer with a modest government pension, Quiroz still makes more in 12 to 16 grueling hours of packing fresh tomatoes than he could back home.

A QUESTION OF "DISBALANCE"

In Mexico his children are professionals: a lawyer, a soccer player, a college professor and a plant manager.

Still, when he considered his own economic future, Quiroz and his wife elected to make their way to U.S. farm fields where he can get \$10,000 for eight months' work, more than three times what he could earn in the local tortilla factory in Mexico—the best job he could find there.

Quiroz, who plans to go with other migrant workers to see Fox and Bush speak, said he would tell his president that he can't live a good life in Mexico for the wages he can get. "The main problem in Mexico is the disbalance," Quiroz said. "The price of products is more than the wages paid."

UAW local President Bruce Baumhower says he is up against that too. "Every one of the companies we've gone in to bargain with said, 'We could move down there and make it [their product] for nothing.'" Stories like his distress Rep. Kaptur, whose constituents still recall the time she took President Clinton to task for his position on trade, embarrassing him onstage in 1996 as he stumped for president in her hometown.

Kaptur—who has yet to hear from the White House about the trip to her district—won't get an opportunity to speak her mind when Bush and Fox visit a community center that serves a largely Latino clientele, and then the University of Toledo, where the presidents plan to speak about education.

Her feelings haven't changed, though. "America's biggest internal conflict was the Civil War, which was fought over the expansion of the slave system into the West. All we've done with the trade issue is move the border," she said.

Many of her concerns are shared by Mexican American leader Baldemar Velasquez, whose Farm Labor Organizing Committee represents about 7,000 migrant workers. Velasquez said his members also believe the post-NAFTA economy has meant fewer decent-paying jobs.

"People try to paint those who are anti-NAFTA as anti-Mexican, and it's the exact opposite," Velasquez said. "A lot of these people can't see the forest through the trees. Without organized labor you lose that necessary tension between people driven to accumulate wealth and the workers who help them do that."

"In Mexico there is no tension—and if we allow that to become the standard then we are just going back in history."

Many credit Velasquez's presence with keeping Toledo's unions focused on economic disparities, not racial differences. Toledo, in fact, has been used as a model for other Midwestern cities grappling with rapidly expanding Latino populations.

Out in one of the cucumber fields, where the late-harvest cucumbers have grown too large to be considered premium—meaning small enough to be pickled whole—Velasquez talked about economic realities.

Under a hard-fought bargaining agreement won by his organization, workers get \$28 per 100 pounds of premium cucumbers picked, plus \$6.20 an hour minimum wage. In Mexico, the same yield would earn slightly more than \$1 per day.

Velasquez agreed to participate in the presidential visit despite having turned down invitations to the Clinton White House out of fear, in his words, of being a prop, a "wooden Indian."

His reason: the chance to talk about general amnesty for undocumented immigrants. "They can't come to town without hearing it from labor," he said.

"And I don't think they can talk about education without talking about amnesty and workers' rights. When parents don't have jobs or are underpaid or are hiding from immigration, those are all fundamental issues when you are talking about educating a child."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2001.

President GEORGE W. BUSH,

The White House,
Washington, DC.

President VICENTE FOX,
Embassy of Mexico,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT BUSH AND PRESIDENT FOX: During this Labor Day week, and on behalf of our entire community, I extend an official welcome to you both on your historic journey here among us. We look forward to your visit and to your remarks. We also hope you will listen and learn as our citizenry "speak truth to power." Building on this trip, we look forward to establishing a working relationship with your respective Administrations to address continental issues of mutual concern. Please let me propose the establishment of an "Intercontinental Organization on Working Life and Cooperation in the Americas."

First and foremost, we seek your leadership and engagement on the economic and social consequences of NAFTA in both nations. The serious dislocation of millions of industrial and agricultural workers, as well as small and medium sized firms, demands serious and compassionate action by those sworn to serve their fellow citizens. In our region (Ohio, Michigan and Indiana) post-NAFTA, over 115,621 good paying jobs have been lost to the maquiladora zone, where workers toil for hunger wages and have no job security. Ohio is among the top five states in our union losing jobs due to NAFTA (37,694). Nationally, since NAFTA, over 776,030 middle class jobs have been relocated to the maquila zone. Philips Electronics in Ottawa, Ohio, the latest plant to announce a shut down in production, will terminate hundreds of middle class workers. Spangler's Candy, in Bryan, Ohio, has announced it will shift some of its candy cane production to Mexico. Last week in Chicago, Brach's Candy, employing 1,500 with a major segment of Latino-American workers, announced it is shutting down its century old factory there, and moving production either to Mexico or Argentina. The displacement of high paying, middle class manufacturing jobs across the U.S. is fueled by NAFTA, and will only worsen if the proposed Free Trade

Area of the Americas agreement ignores the plight of workers. With NAFTA and FTAA, only investment is given free rein in our hemisphere. Our goal is "Fair Trade, Free People."

Meanwhile, 3,200 multinational firms located in the maquiladora zone have shaped the modern scourge of the dreaded sweatshop. Nearly one million Mexicans, largely women, work in high productivity poverty, with no freely elected labor representation, no job security. The U.S.-Mexico border is plagued by alarming rates of tuberculosis, sewage effluent flowing into drinking water, moot environmental laws, and crumbling infrastructure that cannot bear the load being placed on it. Grinding poverty drives the immigration that is a primary subject of your visit.

The root causes of the immigration crisis lie in the deep and continuing disparity between compensation and living standards of workers on either side of our border. Our continent needs a common minimum wage and common labor standards. Trade agreements MUST recognize and include labor rights in the central bodies of their accords. No nation of conscience should ignore the plight of the dispossessed, the worker without representation, the small holders and campesinos and indigenous people who have no voice. As the powerful force of capital moves across borders so must labor have equal status in any economic accord. Further, NAFTA remains seriously deficient in providing structural adjustment assistance to cushion intercontinental economic integration.

Trade relationships should yield mutually beneficial economic and social benefits, not a legacy of growing political instability. Our U.S. trade relationship with Mexico is becoming increasingly distorted. Before NAFTA, the U.S. held a \$3 billion surplus with Mexico. Post NAFTA, the U.S. surplus has turned into a growing cumulative deficit of over \$140 billion, with last year's record high of \$30 billion. In Mexico, we have witnessed the devaluation of the peso, wage cutbacks, and now job terminations in the maquilas due to a U.S. economic slowdown. Indeed, northern Mexico has become the low wage export platform to the U.S. that opponents of NAFTA predicted. Nearly 90% of maquila production is exported back to the U.S. (and nearly the same from our Canadian counterparts) as Mexico becomes a vast importer of goods from Asia. Long term, this is an economic relationship that is damaging to our continent. The current economic arrangement means the workers of Mexico cannot afford to buy what they make, and their U.S. counterparts lose their living wage jobs as the downward pressure on remaining jobs continues unabated. High productivity poverty with hunger wages in Mexico and displaced U.S. workers do not good neighbors make. As the slogan reads, justice must come to the maquiladoras.

In the countryside, the story is even worse. Over 30 million Mexican farmers are being cruelly uprooted from their historic lands. This is a continental sacrilege of enormous proportions. Some, understandably, escape across our border. Some die in the Arizona desert. Others seek shelter in Mexico City's sprawling metropolis as overextended local services strain under the crush of rapid population growth. Last year, over 360 Mexicans seeking refuge or work died at our border. What kind of cruel economic system is it that tramples on their humanity and pits them against farmers and workers in our countryside who have labored for a century to gain sustenance and a decent way of life, collective bargaining rights, and dignity in the work place? An Intercontinental Agricultural Working Committee must be included

as a key component of the Intercontinental Organization I propose.

President Bush, I understand that during your visit to our community you seek to discuss "common problems on our border, problems with drug interdiction, problems with environmental issues, problems with water and immigration." I can assure you that every single one of these problems arises from a flawed NAFTA agreement that leaves working people and the social compact out of the investment equation. It took our nation nearly a century, and a Civil War, to reject a form of indentured servitude in which workers were chattel. Our society still bears the scars of that war. In Mexico, I have witnessed the fear of workers bound to an economic system in which they hold no independent voice, where independent collective bargaining for the value of their work is impossible, and where their hard work and high productivity yield only more poverty. Here at home, I have witnessed our middle class workers who have struggled to build a way of life have the rug pulled out from under them by forces beyond their control. This surely cannot be your blueprint for our continent in this new millennium.

Something is seriously wrong when workers do not earn enough to buy what they make. It troubles me greatly that in Toluca, Mexico workers who assemble the popular PT Cruisers for DaimlerChrysler do not earn a living wage; every single one of the cars they build are shipped to the U.S. Reciprocally, it bothers me greatly that Toledo's DaimlerChrysler workers who attempted to bid on some portion of backlogged PT Cruiser production were summarily turned down. Since all the production from the Toluca plant is sent through the backdoor into the U.S., why shouldn't the workers in both plants be covered by the same collective bargaining agreement, along with their supplier firms? Otherwise, all that production yields from a continental standpoint is a race to the bottom for the workers.

Equally, in the countryside, it troubles me that northwest Ohio's fresh tomato and pickle businesses are increasingly threatened by Sinaloa plants and packing sheds. Yet field workers in both nations have no hope of a better life as their production is pitted against one another and they compete for survival wage jobs. Again, our continent needs an open forum in which to address and grapple with these serious questions.

Finally, I extend to you both an invitation to travel with bipartisan delegations from both countries. Let us tour U.S. and Mexican production sites, industrial and agricultural. Let us freely hear from the workers. Let us for the sake of the common good explore openly the dimensions of NAFTA that must be repaired. Let us do what is just. We should strive for an intercontinental accord that elevates our people, not exploits them, that uses the power of economic development and the marketplace to spur the necessary social and physical infrastructure to build great nations and treat our people with respect.

Pope John Paul II captured the essence of the challenge before us when he wrote:

"The market imposes its way of thinking and acting and stamps its scale of values upon behavior."

"What is happening is that changes in technology and work relationships are moving too quickly for cultures to respond. Social, legal and cultural safeguards are vital."

"Globalization often risks destroying these carefully built up structures, by exacting the adoption of new styles of working, living and organizing communities."

"Globalization must not be a new version of colonization."

The Pope stressed that on its course towards globalization, humanity cannot do

without an ethical code which must be "wholly independent from financial, ideological or political partisan views. . . . Humanity can no longer do without a common code of ethics."

To this end, I would dedicate my full energies, as would the people of our community.

Most sincerely,

MARCY KAPTUR,
Member of Congress.

THE STATE OF AMERICA'S BUDGET, THE FATE OF THE BUDGET SURPLUS, AND DILEMMAS TO COME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss the topic that is foremost on the minds of many Americans, which is the state of our budget, the question of what happened to the surplus that existed in this country in the Federal budget only a few short months ago, and the consequences of the change and the dilemmas that we face over the next few years.

What has happened recently, of course, by now is well known. Both the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office have come up with revised projections of the surplus for this year and for the next 10 years. Those surplus projections are, of course, dramatically different from what the President was saying and what my friends on the Republican side of the aisle were saying just a few short months ago.

As an example of the kind of statement that the President was making when he was traveling across the country pitching his tax cut, I thought I would give this example of what he said in Portland, Maine, in my district on March 23 of this year.

This was his basic argument. He said, "Now I know these numbers sound like a lot, but this is reality I'm talking about. We have increased discretionary spending by 4 percent, we pay down \$2 trillion worth of debt, we set aside \$1 trillion in the budget over a 10-year period for contingencies, and guess what, there's still money left over, and that's the debate. The fundamental question is, what to do with it."

Today we know there is no money left over. Apart from some small surplus over the next 5 or 6 years in the Medicare and Social Security accounts, a very small surplus, there is no surplus over the next 5 years. In fact, almost all of what remains of the surplus is in fact a Social Security surplus that is primarily in the second 5 years of the next decade and not in the next 5 years.

What I want to do tonight is to begin by focusing on some of these statements. The first one worth calling attention to is the statement of the President that "We have increased discretionary spending by 4 percent."

Let us look at the reality. At the time, March 23, when he made this statement, the President had not submitted a budget for defense. As we all know now, he asked for a major increase in defense spending, over \$30 billion.

Let us take a look for a moment at a chart which shows or which compares this Administration's budget request to the last year of the Clinton administration's budget request. The Clinton administration asked for \$38 billion in fiscal year 2001, the year in which we are in, above budget outlays in fiscal year 2000; \$38 billion more last year. Of course, our current President has roundly criticized President Clinton and the previous administration for being big spenders, for spending out of control.

Members will note that that budget request is about a 6.7 percent increase in budget authority over the previous year. That is what President Clinton was asking for in his last year. Who is the big spender here? President Bush's request is \$44 billion, \$6 billion more than President Clinton requested in his last year in office.

This \$44 billion represents the extent to which that is the increase in budget outlays requested by this administration for fiscal year 2002 above the fiscal 2001 budget: a \$44 billion increase. That works out to almost around a 7.2 percent increase in budget authority.

When he was back in Portland in May, and in fact in speeches all around the country, the President said over and over again, "We are only asking for a 4 percent increase in discretionary spending, only 4 percent, and that is a reasonable. That is far less than the Clinton administration was asking."

But when the defense request rolls in and is considered, the President, this President, is actually asking for a bigger increase in spending than the previous administration did in its last year in office. That is part, but only part, of the problem.

Let us go back to another part of the statement that President Bush made in Portland, Maine, on March 23. He said, "We set aside \$1 trillion in the budget over a 10-year period for contingencies, and guess what? There is money left over."

I have been reading the newspapers, as any other American in the last month and a half, and I have not heard one word, not one word, either in the press or from this administration, about the \$1 trillion in contingencies. Whatever happened to the \$1 trillion contingency fund? Surely a slight decline in economic productivity, a decline in economic growth in this year, which should have been able to be handled by \$1 trillion in contingencies.

□ 2030

Well, as the ad says, not exactly. There was not exactly a \$1 trillion fund for contingencies; and in fact, it was not there at all. Those contingencies

were, in fact, obligations, and not all of them that we will have to meet in this Congress and with the administration over the next 10 years. There was no trillion dollar fund, a true contingency fund. It did not exist in March, and it clearly does not exist today.

Let us talk about what the situation is today. The truth is that this year, the fiscal year that ends on September 30, is very different from what it was projected earlier in this year. This year, the Government will tap \$29 billion from Medicare surplus taxes and \$9 billion from Social Security revenues simply to fund government operations for fiscal year 2002, for the coming fiscal year.

Over the next 5 years the President's tax cut and the decline in economic growth together will force a \$30 billion diversion from the Social Security Trust Fund and a \$170 billion diversion from the Medicare Trust Fund. These are uses of Medicare revenues and of Social Security revenues that virtually every Member of this House pledged not to do. Virtually every Member of this House stood up and said we are going to protect Social Security revenues, excess revenues, Social Security surplus, and we are going to protect the Medicare surplus; but today, it is very different.

These are, of course, CBO projections, the recent CBO projections; and, in fact, they are too conservative themselves to actually be realistic. Why? Because the way CBO does its projections, it assumes that there will be no change in existing law, and we know there will be changes in existing law.

Let me give a few examples. These baseline estimates do not assume any of the additional spending included either in the budget that President Bush has presented or the congressional budget resolution for defense, for education, or for a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Those increases are simply not included in the CBO projections.

In fact, some of that funding will occur; and so the problem we have is one that was created by the fact that, as many of us said back in March and April, the President's tax cut was too big to be responsible budgeting. We also argued it was too weighted to the wealthiest Americans, which it was and which it is.

Fundamentally, we argued at the time, we said over and over again, this will use up all of the available on-budget, non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus; and as we said repeatedly, we have agreed not to use surplus funds for Medicare and Social Security.

Today, we know that the President's tax cut has threatened that possibility. I am not talking about the \$300 or the \$600 tax rebates that about 60 percent of American taxpayers have received or will receive. That is a relatively small factor in the problem that we face.

What I am talking about is what happens over the next few years. Over the

next few years, compared to the last eight, during the greatest period of economic expansion in our Nation's history, what is happening over the next few years is we will divert billions and billions and billions of dollars to people in this country, the wealthiest 1 percent who earn over \$300,000 every single year.

Though we have enormous problems in this country, problems with finding qualified teachers to teach our young people, problems with ensuring that people who graduate from high school and want to go to college can actually get there and get the education they need to be productive citizens in this world, problems with those seniors in my district and all around the country who look at people who are employed who have health care, who get prescription drug coverage through their health care plan, they say to me, why do we not have prescription drug coverage through our health care plan, which is Medicare.

Those people need some help. They deserve some help. It is outrageous that the wealthiest country in the world at the time, until just recently, of its greatest prosperity, cannot somehow find the resources to provide our seniors with a prescription drug benefit that is comparable to the benefit that those Americans who are employed, who are working, have for a prescription drug benefit through their own insurance.

What is fair for our working people ought to be fair for our seniors. But back for a moment to the CBO projections.

As I said, the CBO estimates do not assume any additional spending included in the Bush budget or the congressional budget resolution for defense, for education or for Medicare prescription drugs. The figures also omit the cost of extending expiring tax credits, funding anticipated emergencies for natural disasters, or paying for the \$73.5 billion farm reauthorization bill for which the budget resolution provided.

Let us look at what this means over the next few years. The President's budget alone plus his tax policies and spending requests invades the Social Security surplus for the next 6 years for a total of \$128 billion. It invades the Medicare surplus for the next 8 years for a total of \$304 billion. This year, fiscal year 2001 ending on September 30, the Government must tap \$29 billion from Medicare and \$9 billion from Social Security to fund routine government operations.

Now, one of the reasons that that is true in fiscal year 2001 is this administration, knowing that it faced a shortfall in next year, fiscal year 2002, they delayed the date on which certain corporate income taxes would have to be paid from September 30 to October 15. That is a gimmick. We can only do this once. The effect of that was to move \$33 billion in current revenues to the next fiscal year in revenues. When we

move that \$33 billion, we are very close to creating the deficit that we have created in the current fiscal year. That kind of gimmick which now it appears this administration has adopted in a number of areas is irresponsible budgeting.

Let us go for a moment to a different chart. Let us go to a chart which talks about the impact of the surplus over the next several years. As this chart shows, the Bush budget wipes out the surplus. There is going to be a lot of debate in these Chambers about what happened to the surplus, not just what happened to that supposed \$1 trillion contingency fund, but what happened to the surplus.

It was not so long ago that people were saying we can see surpluses as far as the eye can see. Now they are gone. They are all gone. Here is basically what happened: the CBO in May 2001 baseline showed a surplus of \$2.745 trillion. Now, what has happened to that? Well, \$1.66 trillion of that is the total cost of the Bush tax cut. Then we have had an economic slowdown. That is also a factor. The economic slowdown and certain technical factors have caused us to lose another \$639 billion or .639 trillion dollars.

Now you have additional funding requests from the President of .767 trillion or \$767 billion, and it is the combination of these three factors that drive us into deficit over a 10-year period. Let me say a little bit about that surplus. This deficit and the surpluses are not distributed evenly over the next 10 years. In fact, if you look at a chart that shows year by year what happens to the surplus, in fact, there is either a deficit or a minuscule surplus for the next 5 years, and then you have a projected surplus over the second 5 years of the decade with the largest surplus of all, over \$200 billion in the final year.

Well, why is the largest piece of surplus the tenth year out? Well, another gimmick because basically what happened when the tax cut was passed, the House passed a \$1.6 trillion tax cut. The other body passed a \$1.35 trillion tax cut, both of them calculated over 10 years. But when the conferees got together, they liked tax cuts so much, not just the \$300 and \$600 rebate this year, but tax cuts for the wealthy extending out over the 10-year period that really drained enormous amounts of revenue from the Federal budget, making it extraordinarily difficult to meet the educational, the health care, the environmental, and the job-training needs of our population.

When you look at that last year, you will find that the tax cut sunsets on December 31, 2010. So that the last year of this coming decade is one where the estate tax is back just as it is today, where the tax rates are back just as they are today. All of the tax code changes that are passed in the President's tax cut bill are eliminated and the tax code reverts to what it is today.

Why was that done? Well, it was done to keep all the tax breaks and yet to stay within a \$1.35 trillion number. That gimmick makes all of these budget numbers look actually better than they are in the real world.

In the real world this country faces some enormous challenges. This is going to be a difficult fall. I think Members on both sides of the aisle agree because we have gone from surpluses from the non-Social Security, non-Medicare accounts to deficits; and we have done it within just a few months of this administration's election to office. We have done it primarily, not exclusively, but primarily because the size of the Bush tax cut was so large as to be completely irresponsible.

That is why back in March, back in April, back in May so many of us on the Democratic side of the aisle were saying we ought to have a tax cut, we ought to have a large tax cut. It ought to be about \$800 billion. If we had set aside a tax cut, if we had done a tax cut of \$800 billion, we would not be running into deficit projections now. We, in fact, would have those funds to make sure that Social Security and Medicare would be shored up over the next few years and not at the risk of being weakened simply because of our irresponsible budgeting. We would be looking at fully funding special education.

I do not know anyone, Republican or Democrat, who is not hearing from people in his district about the need to live up to our commitment to fully fund special education at the 40 percent that, frankly, was the goal when the special education IDEA Act was enacted in 1974. But if the money is not there, if the surplus is gone, it will not happen. That is what we were saying.

We were saying that you cannot project over 10 years with any degree of confidence. Boy, were we right about that one. We did not have to wait 2 years or 4 years or 5 years or 8 years to test the accuracy of these projections. In just 3 months, in just 3 months the numbers change dramatically. As you can see right here, minus \$639 billion dollars over 10 years, a change in the projection in just 3 months. But it is that kind of change that many of us were saying, you cannot predict the future with any degree of confidence; and, therefore, what we need to do is to be cautious, not have a tax cut so large that it eats up all of the budget surplus and causes us to dipping into revenues from Social Security and Medicare. We argued then it was irresponsible, and it is more clear than ever today that that course of action was, in fact, irresponsible.

I see that I am joined by a couple of my colleagues here tonight, and I want to recognize them in a few moments. I think I would like to close these brief remarks by saying this.

□ 2045

When Members look at what is happening with the tax cut, so large that

it is jeopardizing our fiscal health, so large that it is making Alan Greenspan's actions at the Fed not as effective as they might be because people understand if we are moving straight to deficit as projections of surplus, long-term interest rates are going to stay up; and for businesses, for homeowners, for all of those people who borrow over some extended period of time, if long-term interest rates are going to stay up, we are not going to do as well. The Federal Government is going to be paying higher interest. The businesses will be paying higher long-term interest rates. Homeowners will be paying higher long-term interest rates.

Remember, this economy took off in 1993. This Congress and the administration said, we are going to cut spending and make sure that the very wealthiest Americans pay their fair share of taxes. What happened? Interest rates went down and the deficits turned into surpluses, and the economy took off. It is the reversal of those fundamental policies which is jeopardizing the economic health of this country which is so serious.

We are going to be debating in the next last few weeks and perhaps months about the budget. It is really fundamentally a debate about the future. Fundamentally it is a debate about whether we are going to reduce the amount that we spend together on those things that we can only do together.

What am I talking about is, Abraham Lincoln said in 1854, the role of governments is to do those things that a community of individuals cannot do or cannot do so well alone. We cannot create a public education system one by one, and yet every business in this country depends on having a well-educated, well-trained work force.

We cannot take care of our seniors one by one, individually. That is why Medicare and Social Security were created.

We cannot do an interstate highway system, we cannot provide for the common defense, we cannot lift up this country so that individuals in this country can reach their full potentials unless we use our government, as well as other voluntary associations, to do things together that we cannot do as individuals.

The fundamental theory underlying the President's tax cut was that we take every dollar out of Washington, and that is good. Even if that dollar would educate a kid who cannot get Head Start now because there is not enough money to serve every kid who qualifies for Head Start, even if that dollar would help seniors pay for prescription drugs when they are not taking their medicine now because they have to buy food instead, even if that dollar represents a loan to someone who could then go on and get the college education that they feel they need. That is what this country ultimately is all about. We are here somehow to help each other lift each other

up, to hang together on things that are of fundamental public importance.

But this tax cut was about me and not about we. The health of this country depends on getting back and moving from me to we, from doing well, investing in ourselves, investing in this country, making sure that the people of this country have a fighting chance to get ahead. They cannot do that. They will not do that. They have no chance to do that. If the Federal Government slides back into deficits, if we cannot fund education, if we cannot fund health care and shore up the infrastructure of this country and provide opportunity for all of the people who live here and to our children.

The last thing we wanted to do was to shift expenses, shift costs from this generation to our children, but the President's tax cut was so large that is exactly what it is doing. Unless we make changes and unless we figure out how to get out of this problem, we are right back in deficits and we are jeopardizing the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I congratulate my colleague for bringing to the Nation this Special Order with regard to the budget and the dilemma that we find ourselves in this evening.

The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) has been in the forefront of working on these issues and making the public aware, and I am happy to join him.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is facing a serious shortfall in the budget. This is because the Congress and the President have chosen short-term reward over the long-term benefit of paying down the debt and protecting Social Security and Medicare. There are colleagues of mine in the Congress who have not joined in this and have fought against the tax cut and against the proposed budget. But the majority of Congress unfortunately went along with the President on that tax cut, and we are all paying for that today.

Since February 7, 2001, I have been on record stressing the importance of protecting retirement security and enacting a prescription drug benefit. I want all Americans to see every penny they earn working for them.

Social Security is our system to protect retirement benefits for older people. Medicare provides seniors with health benefits. What could be a better use of our surplus than long-term security? If Americans could be guaranteed to pay \$300 or even \$600 and not have to worry about their retirement savings or health benefits from now to one's last years, Americans would do it. Many poorer Americans are told they need that \$300 check, but that money is nothing if Members think about the benefits that could be accrued if we collectively joined our money into a pool that would, in fact, fund a prescription drug benefit for seniors.

Thanks to the administration, we are all getting our refund checks now, and

maybe some of us are able to put more money to our credit card debt, buy a little something for our homes or a luxury like a new pair of shoes. Then what? Can Americans take a prescription out of a bag of shoes? Can Americans take a prescription out of a luxury car? I think not.

Thanks to the President's refund and the state of our economy, the government is facing financial shortfalls. Instead of operating in a surplus and each party claiming credit, we are blaming one another for a deficit. The other party's leaders choose to ignore the advice of economists forecasting a shrinking surplus, and all indications are that the economy has begun to slow.

The surplus was once expected to be about \$125 billion. The Congressional Budget Office is estimating the present surplus is nearly zero. Things have changed over the last 3 months. The White House is spinning blame to the Congress, but it is unwilling to accept the fact that the President's tax cut has eaten up the surplus. Just like an 800-pound gorilla would go at a banana, it is all gone.

I join the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) and Senate Democrats in urging the President to resubmit a budget. America needs a budget reflecting the current downturn in the economy and the lack of a surplus.

Yesterday I held a prescription drug forum in my district with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who serves on the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Together we discussed the issues of prescription drugs from their availability to the over-prescribing by many physicians and ways to make them more affordable, as well as potential legislation to correct the problem of exorbitantly high drug prices.

The event was highly informative, and I encourage my colleagues throughout the country to hold a similar event. I had more than 250 seniors gathered at the Jewish Community Center to talk about the issue of prescription drugs. I will continue to hold events to allow seniors in my district to air their grievances and help formulate answers on this issue.

The money that the President's tax cut will take out of the budget surplus affects these seniors. They are seeking a prescription drug benefit, seeking help to make ends meet and still be able to afford their medication. The Bush budget not only does not allot money for Social Security, but takes their Social Security and Medicare money away. They do not need \$300 to spend. This will not buy more than one prescription in many instances, because drugs for senior citizens are very expensive, and they are not able to afford them once they are placed on that prescription.

The tax cut is like a classic Trojan horse. The President is trying to convince us that he has delivered a lovely gift to the American people. But once

inside the gate, this gift will prove to merely camouflage far more sinister designs: windfalls for the wealthy and a return to the bad days of deficits and inadequate funding.

How many employers of a business would award job bonuses to employees for the next 10 years in a row in advance, based on projected business income? We all know that is not good business sense. We tried this before, this whole thing about trickle-down economics. Remember the promise: If we give money back, the money will trickle-down to the most in need. Remember what happened: We found out that the poor got poorer and the rich got richer.

I just say to the American public that are listening this evening, we are pushing this President to reconsider the budget which has been submitted. The people who are most in need of help from a governmental budget are our seniors who have paid their taxes, who have worked very long and are being forced to spend their personal dollars down to nothing in order to get a governmental benefit.

I call upon my colleagues and the rest of this Congress and the Senate to do what is best and what is important, and I call upon this President who kept talking about throughout his campaign that he was going to help those most in need, to do what is right, resubmit this budget, put in a prescription drug benefit and make our seniors know that we love them, want to support them and encourage them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. They help shed light on what the gentlewoman's constituents and many others are facing.

Mr. Speaker, the President's tax cut is the primary reason for the elimination of the surplus within just a few months of his administration. Now that we are in this predicament, it is up to him to come forward and say, how do we deal with this.

During the campaign, the President said I will not touch \$1 of the Social Security revenue. A few weeks ago, on August 24, 2001, he conceded that he might have to invade the Social Security surplus in time of war or recession. We are certainly not in a recession now.

Yesterday he said that he would not do anything that would invade the Social Security surpluses, but the Congressional Budget Office numbers say we are and we are doing it now. We are doing it this year, and there needs to be some leadership from the White House to explain how we possibly get out of this predicament.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is here today, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for organizing this Special Order and commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs.

JONES) for the leadership that she has shown on important issues affecting Americans across the country, the Social Security and Medicare programs which are vitally important, the passion that she has for instituting a real prescription drug plan, which was on everyone's agenda in last year's campaign.

Vice President Gore, virtually every Member of Congress, when we were running for Congress last year, were talking about the need to deal with the rising cost of prescription drugs, but no one has highlighted this issue more than the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who organized this Special Order.

He saw this problem quite awhile ago, and saw the impact that this was having on seniors on fixed incomes. He has been providing leadership in this Congress in trying to institute a bipartisan prescription drug plan, as well as talking about the importance of maintaining the solvency of Social Security and Medicare. That is really what this discussion is about tonight. That is why I commend the gentleman from Maine for talking about it.

Mr. Speaker, it is all about how do we, given the current situation, the economic slowdown and the budget numbers that we are facing, maintain fiscal discipline in this Congress so we can maintain the solvency and protect the sanctity of the Social Security and Medicare programs.

□ 2100

The way I see it, the greatest fiscal challenge our country is facing today is the fact that we have an aging population, a population that is getting older, and a baby boom generation who will all start to retire at basically the same time, 2015, 2020, thereabouts, and they will all be bigger, these programs, Social Security and Medicare, at about the same time. So what can we do today in order to deal with that advent we know is going to come and is going to hit our country but especially affect our children and our grandchildren that is going to make sense?

One of the areas is maintaining fiscal discipline. That is why it took so long in order to turn the corner and be able to start walling off both the Social Security and Medicare trust funds. It is a pledge that virtually every Member on this floor has made over the last few years. It is a pledge that the current administration and the President in the White House now made in last year's campaign, and it is a pledge that is in serious jeopardy today in light of the new Congressional Budget Office numbers. These numbers are important, because the issue is one that is very simple, and that is being able to protect these trust funds and keep its dedicated purpose for reducing the publicly held national debt.

Why is this so important? The question before us is will it be easier for us to deal with the advent of the baby boom generation going into retirement

if we also have to deal simultaneously with paying off all the Federal IOUs that are in our Federal debt today? I submit that that is an impossible proposition to meet, dealing with the aging population, with the huge inflow of the population in Social Security and Medicare, paying off those IOUs that are currently in the trust fund while at the same time we are being asked to pay off the Federal debt and the publicly held Federal debt.

That is why it makes such good sense, fiscal sense, to take this opportunity now of preserving this trust fund money, reducing the national debt, so we are on much sounder fiscal footing to deal with the aging population. That is really what this debate is about.

Yes, the President is correct in saying that dipping into the trust fund today is not going to affect the current payments going out to current recipients. That is true. Because IOUs are still going to be added to those trust fund accounts. But if the money behind the IOUs is meaningless and spent for other purposes, then why do we not just reduce FICA taxes today, still continue to throw the paper IOUs in these trust funds and deal with it when they come due which is what I am hearing the current administration basically proposing.

Mitch Daniels, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in the administration, is basically saying that there is nothing inherently wrong with using the trust fund for a plus-up in defense spending, for instance, because the country is still going to meet those IOUs that are added to the trust fund.

But if we are not taking this opportunity to reduce the national debt today, it is going to make it very difficult to meet those obligations in the future. I think that is such a fundamental point in this entire debate. The difference in these numbers must be important whether we are looking at Congressional Budget Office numbers or Office of Management and Budget, the administration's budget numbers, because, correct me if I am wrong and maybe the gentleman from Maine has a better memory than this, but back in 1995 when the Republican leadership in Congress decided to take on the Clinton budget numbers, it was over the stated purpose that the Clinton administration was relying on their own OMB numbers to justify their budget calculations rather than relying on the Congressional Budget Office numbers.

Now we have the same situation today, where many of us are crying foul because of the bookkeeping and the gimmicks that are being played with OMB numbers, I mean some bookkeeping changes that have not been made in the last 35 years in order to pretend as if we are not dipping into these trust funds. I think there is some political rhetoric being used here in what numbers we are using, but the fundamental point is that I am hoping

that this Congress and the administration working with us will be able to find a bipartisan solution to continue using the trust fund money to reduce our national debt so we are going to be in the fiscal position to deal with the aging population and the baby boomers when it comes time for them to retire and start entering these very important programs.

Mr. ALLEN. I had a couple of thoughts that were triggered by the gentleman's comments. First of all, the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. It was the Republicans insisting on using CBO numbers and not OMB numbers because they said then the CBO numbers were more accurate than the OMB numbers. The same holds true today.

Mr. KIND. As the gentleman recalls, the ultimate outcome of that insistence back in 1995 led to the shutdown of the Federal Government. Because the leadership in Congress was insistent that the administration use CBO numbers rather than OMB numbers and it led to the shutdown of the government which as we later found out was not exactly popular with the vast majority of Americans throughout the country.

Mr. ALLEN. And not something we want to go through again. But there is a further point in that connection. I had another chart but I do not have it here today which shows that during the first Bush administration, the economic projections from OMB as to the health of the economy were always significantly above, about .8, .7 percent above the consensus private forecasts. That is about what the first year of this administration's projections of economic growth are above the private forecasts. So now under both the first Bush administration and now the second Bush administration, we see that OMB is more optimistic about the economy than the private forecasts.

You have to say to yourself, what is going on here? They are trying to make the numbers look good so the budgets look good so they can get through an immediate funding crisis. If you look at the Clinton administration, in the 8 years of the Clinton administration, only in 2 years were the OMB projections above the consensus private forecasts. In 2 of those years, they were exactly the same. In the other 4 years, they were actually lower. They were more conservative than the consensus private forecasts. One of the disturbing aspects of this administration in its first few months is that it looks and feels as if the Office of Management and Budget has become an arm of the spin machine, that numbers are being manipulated, not just numbers related to projections of future economic growth but numbers that make the accounting change in Social Security that the gentleman was referring to, the gimmick I mentioned earlier about moving \$33 billion in corporate tax revenues from 2001 to 2002, all of these gimmicks, all of this

manipulation is really a way to kind of make the numbers come out right.

But that is not the way we ought to be doing our budgeting. It is not conservative. It is not fiscally responsible. We ought to be getting the best numbers we can and then be arguing policy. But we should not have to be doing what we have wound up doing the first few months of this administration which is arguing about the accuracy of the numbers. That did not happen to anything like this extent before. It really is important that OMB get back on track with CBO and stop manipulating numbers because we have got a real problem.

Mr. KIND. These are not insignificant differences, a percentage point here, a percentage point there on projected economic growth. When you project it out over 4, 5, 10 years, these numbers explode on you. And so it is important that we deal with an accurate projection and description of what the economy is doing and forecasting. When you see the OMB starting to manipulate these numbers, have these gimmicks within the bookkeeping system that have never been tried before in the last 40 years, it undermines the confidence that many of us have in the numbers that the administration is using in order to justify their budget requests. And it makes it a much more difficult proposition then to work in a bipartisan fashion to reach agreement on these important issues. That is why many of us earlier in the year when we were discussing the merits of a tax cut of this size were using more conservative numbers. Many of us supported an alternative tax proposal, one that was based on more conservative economic figures because we felt it was prudent and made fiscal sense to hedge our bets a little bit because as quickly as the surplus can appear, many of us knew it could disappear.

Given the incredible size of our Nation's economy, a slight change in growth one way or the other was going to have a huge impact on budgetary decisions before this Congress. So many of us supported an alternative tax relief plan that would provide meaningful tax relief to working families, dealt with the marriage penalty, dealt with estate tax relief or family-owned businesses and family farms but within a more fiscally responsible framework, not of the magnitude of the tax cut that was ultimately passed and which is now having the most important impact on dipping into the Social Security trust fund again.

The reason why many of us felt it was important to be somewhat conservative was because of the obligations our Nation faced, of Social Security, Medicare, trying to come up with a bipartisan prescription drug plan that was going to provide meaningful relief to our seniors who are suffering under this burden of escalating drug prices that they need to have, our obligations to a strong national defense, just quality of life with our military personnel.

This was not going to come cheap. In fact, the President is still calling for a 9 percent increase in defense spending, roughly \$20 billion that does not exist right now. It puts a lot of us in a tough position that supported many of these policy proposals but because of the slowdown because of the magnitude of the tax cut, it is going to make it very difficult for us to meet these obligations for our Nation.

Mr. ALLEN. Again, I think what we are trying to say is that if any of us have a child 5 or 10 years away from going to college and we know we are going to be paying for that out of our own pockets, the prudent thing to do is start setting aside some money to pay for the college expenses. If we are the owners of a business and we can see that we have reached the capacity of growth within our existing buildings and we are either going to grow and do a major expansion or we are going to be at a competitive disadvantage and we have to do that in 3 or 4 or 5 years, we would start to figure out how to set aside funds to be able to do that when the time comes.

We are, as a country, in the same spot with respect to Social Security and Medicare. We know that the leading edge of the baby boom generation within 9 or 10 years is going to start to qualify for those two programs. So as many of us have argued over and over and over again, even though we have lost the point on the debate in the tax cut, we have said what is prudent to do is to use the Social Security and Medicare surpluses to pay down the national debt, to reduce the amount we pay in interest costs on the national debt, to be ready to wade in and support those two programs when the baby boom generation starts to move into them. That would be prudent fiscal planning. It is not prudent to go out and take a big vacation right now and spend all of the surplus over the next 5 or 6 years based on projections that we knew even a few months ago were inherently unreliable.

I want to come back to the way I began, the statement that the President made in Portland, Maine on March 23. He said, "We've increased discretionary spending by 4 percent." Not exactly. Right now, now that the defense budget is in, that 4 percent number is 7.2. It should read, "We've increased discretionary spending by 7.2 percent," 7.2 percent more than the Clinton administration did in the last year of that administration.

He also said, "We set aside \$1 trillion in the budget over a 10-year period for contingencies." Well, not exactly. It was not true then. It is not true now. If it were true then, if there were truly a contingency fund, we would not be in the dilemma that we are in today because we have not had a loss of \$1 trillion just from economic or technical factors, although it is \$639 billion. This tax cut was rushed through. It was too big to be responsible, it was too weighted to the wealthiest Americans,

and it was rushed through without considering either how the economic numbers, how the projections would work out over time and without even the President's own request for defense which has turned out to be by far the biggest increase, not education as he was saying in March, the biggest increase in his proposal.

If we are going to get back on track, we have to be honest about the numbers and honest about the claims and look at this problem we have with our budget, look at exactly what caused it, largely the tax cut, also the economic slowdown, also some additional requests for spending by the administration and also some other numbers that we have to deal with. But let us look at the numbers honestly and let us try to figure out how to work our way through this to get the best result for the American people.

Mr. KIND. I do not want to speak on behalf of my friend from Maine, but for me really the crux of the issue is what decisions can we make in this body that will set up our younger generation, the next generation, for success later on in life, so that they can meet the obligations that they are going to face when the reins of leadership turn over to them. I fear that if we make it impossible by not reducing national debt, by not shoring up the Social Security and Medicare trust funds, it is going to be impossible for that next generation to meet those obligations and we will see a fiscal crisis never before witnessed in this Nation.

It is almost *deja vu* all over again as far as economic policy. We have seen this. It is really the repeat of Reaganomics back in the early 1980s where they ushered through this huge tax cut but also simultaneously tried paying for a huge increase in defense spending which led to year after year, a whole decade's worth of deficit financing which left us in a position of dealing with a \$5.7 trillion national debt.

□ 2115

The difference between that then and what we are facing today is back then the country could afford to make that mistake, because we had time to recover.

We do not have that luxury anymore. We have this aging population staring us in the face. They are going to start retiring in the next decade. We do not have the luxury of being able to deal with a fiscal mistake that was made and trying to dig ourselves out of that hole in time to prepare for this aging population.

That is really the big difference between the economic policies of the early eighties and the same type of economic policy being pursued today. We do not have that margin of error in order to correct the mistakes, to dig ourselves out of debt, as we were starting to succeed in doing throughout the decades of the 1990s. Instead, we apparently have now reversed track and have jeopardized the good work being done just a few short years ago.

Mr. ALLEN. What is so startling is all this has happened in just a few months, so those of us who were saying this is a reckless approach, this an irresponsible approach back in March and April, now find ourselves saying, you know, we told you this was a possible outcome. We told you that the policy was irresponsible. Now, Mr. President, how do we dig ourselves out of that?

I think that the point the gentleman was making about Social Security and Medicare, it is very true. But it is also true when I travel around my State of Maine and talk to business owners, for example, they say to me, apart from health care, which seems to be their number one problem, the high cost of health care, they talk about the qualifications of the workforce. They realize that they are only going to succeed if they have well-trained, well-educated, well-qualified workers for the jobs which they need.

It gets harder and harder. If too many kids do not get Head Start, if you do not have enough spending on title I funds for kids from disadvantaged areas, if you are not fully funding special education in accordance with the promises made by this Congress in the past, if young people in this country do not have the funds to go on and get the college or technical college education they need, we are not going to be as strong a country, as competitive; and our businesses will not do as well. Those are simple facts.

Yet the examples I have given are examples of public investments. They cannot be made by our businesses. They cannot be made by individual families, many of whom are struggling and do not have the funds for private school or private college. They are only the kinds of investments that we can make together. We cannot make those investments together if all the money has gone in a tax cut that is too large to be responsible, where most of the money, or at least half of the money, is going to people in this country who make over \$300,000 a year.

We have to look again at this tax cut. We have to figure out how we can make sure that our overall budgeting over the next few years is reasonable, responsible, disciplined and conservative, not irresponsible and reckless, I guess I would say.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield further, with the drastic change in the budget numbers, and there is no sign of immediate economic recovery on the horizon, I think the responsible thing to do, one that really requires real leadership right now and a gut check, is for the administration to submit a new budget proposal, in light of the fact that their own numbers, a 7 percent increase in discretionary spending, is just not affordable right now within the context of the overall budget, unless, again, they are willing to dip into the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds, which I do not think there is a lot of bipartisan support to do.

I think just about everyone in this Chamber now is on record supporting the lockbox proposal, walling off those trust funds, the surpluses being run in those programs for debt reduction; and that is why we are hoping that the administration, the President, will take a look at this and realize that things have changed.

That is okay. Mistakes are made from time to time. But we are still in a position of being able to recover. We are not down this road that far yet. These numbers have just come out. We have not passed the next fiscal year's budget, so there is still time to recover.

It is going to require, I think, a whole lot of cooperation across the aisle and shared responsibility across the aisle to make this add up, to maintain some fiscal discipline, but also meet our obligations that exist.

We have an Elementary and Secondary Education Act we are trying to reauthorize that is going to require resources, bipartisan thinking, in order to solve that dilemma. We have the next farm bill reauthorization to come to the floor here shortly. Lord knows our family farmers are struggling to survive. You talk about a national security issue, food security ranks right up there at the top as well. We have that obligation to meet.

We also need to be thinking long term and maintaining the solvency again of these important programs, like Social Security, Medicare, so we are not just punting on this issue, which would be the easiest thing for us to do today. I think that is one of the reasons why the President appointed his Social Security commission, because he realizes we need to take a hard honest look at this and start finding some bipartisan solutions to the challenges we face.

We still have time to recover. I guess that is one hopeful note in tonight's discussion. Hopefully, we are going to get enough consensus and enough bipartisan work here in the coming weeks before the ultimate budget is passed to recover from the new economic realities and do the right thing for our kids.

I have got two little boys myself. I am a little concerned about the fiscal obligations they are going to be facing. The numbers are not working in their favor right now. With the generational trends with the aging population, more and more will be asked of the next generation to deal with these challenges. We can help by starting today in dealing with accurate economic numbers and making some probably pretty difficult choices in the weeks ahead.

I thank the gentleman again for organizing this Special Order and highlighting in such a coherent fashion the dilemma we are in and the challenges we face.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for being part of this debate. I know we can do better, and we will do our best to do better.

CHALLENGES FACING AMERICA: THE BUDGET AND IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRUCCI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House tonight and to bring to the attention of this body and to the Nation an issue of, I think, extreme importance to us. My original intent was to speak on the issue of immigration, immigration reform, in light of the visit of President Vicente Fox. I intend to do so. I will certainly do so for the majority of my remarks.

But as I sat here in the House waiting for my opportunity to present my observations, I was, of course, listening to the discussion that preceded me with regard to the fiscal dilemma in which the United States finds itself at the present time; and my colleagues on the other side of the House, the Democrats, have concluded that the problem is that we are not taxing Americans enough. They have suggested, for over 1 hour what we have heard, is that we have an enormous task ahead of us because revenue projections are lower than had been anticipated as a result of a turn down in the economy and that, therefore, this Congress is faced with a major dilemma: How do we deal with the fact that we do not have enough money coming into this body?

It is their plan, when they ask the question, how did this problem come about, the answer they provide is that we gave Americans tax breaks. We allowed Americans to keep more of their money. As a result of that, the Democrats say, we are now in this fiscal bind. We now find ourselves in a situation where we may "dip into the Social Security Trust Fund," a trust fund, may I remind you, Mr. Speaker, that was raided, not just partially, but totally, 100 percent, every single year that the Democrats had control of the Congress of the United States. Every single year.

All of a sudden, this new-found concern about the Social Security Trust Fund is, I must admit, greatly appreciated. I am so happy to hear that my friends on the other side of the aisle are worried about this fund, which they successfully raided every single year for 40 years, took every single penny out of it and spent it in the general fund. Now they are worried about getting into that particular fund.

Well, I am glad. This is a major shift in thinking in this body. I hope and I pray that it lasts for a long time. I hope and I pray that every Member of this body will in fact adhere to the pledge to not spend any money out of the Social Security or Medicare Trust Fund in the general fund.

I am one of the 150 Members who have signed a letter to the President of the United States telling him that if he

vetoed any appropriations bill that forces us to dip into that trust fund, we will support his veto. By the way, I did not see a single name of a Member of the other side on that letter, not one.

I was intrigued by the fact that in all this discussion, the 1 hour that has preceded me here about the horrible state of our economy and the horrible state of our budget, not once did I hear, Mr. Speaker, even though there was constant reference to the fact that we may have in fact given too much back to the people in terms of tax breaks, gone way too far, that was said over and over again, way too far in giving back the people of the United States their hard-earned money, giving back, as if it was ours to begin with.

Of course, the appropriate way to phrase it is we allowed them to keep more of their money. But to my friends on the other side of the aisle, any money that we allow an American taxpayer to keep is money we are giving back to them; money that first belongs here in the Congress of the United States, first belongs to be spent by this body, and, if we deign, we will allow Americans to keep part of their tax dollars. But not once, Mr. Speaker, not once in that 1-hour presentation that preceded me, did you hear any one of the various Members on the other side who addressed this issue say the words "let's repeal the tax cut."

You see, Mr. Speaker, every one of us has a wonderful opportunity, being a Member of the Congress of the United States, an incredible, enormous opportunity, and that is to introduce legislation that we believe to be important, that we believe to be helpful to this country. Every one of us here, that is something that we can do. Every one of the Members who spoke here tonight, Mr. Speaker, every one of them, could introduce a bill tomorrow to repeal the tax cut.

We have only sent out half of the checks so far. They could introduce a bill to say stop where you are; we desperately need the money. They could introduce a bill saying for all of the other tax cuts we have passed, for the elimination of the marriage penalty tax, for the elimination of the death tax, for the reduction in the tax rates, we will not reduce them. We will eliminate them. We will get rid of them, because we believe we are in desperate financial straits; and those straits can be addressed, they can be changed, they can be dealt with successfully by taxing Americans more.

You did not hear that, did you, Mr. Speaker, because they did not say it, because they, of course, know that it is politically very unpopular to tell people that we cannot live within our budget in this body; because, my friends, the problem here in Washington is not a lack of revenue from you, from the taxpayers of the United States of America. That is not the problem. Mr. Speaker, the problem is the fact that we in this body collectively spend too much and have spent too much.

One of the other speakers referenced Reaganomics. I am glad he did, because it is, in a way, Reaganomics all over again. But let us look at what Reaganomics really means and what it really was.

□ 2130

It was a time in the Nation's history when we reduced tax rates, not taxes, but tax rates, and we reduced them significantly.

What happened, Mr. Speaker? Was there a dramatic decline in revenues to this government as a result of that reduction that caused deficit spending that we, of course, had? We definitely had deficit spending during the 1980s. Was it because the Reagan tax cuts produced fewer dollars coming into the coffers of the government? No, of course not. It is simply because we spent all of the money.

Not only did it not reduce the revenue coming into the government, it dramatically increased the revenue. Revenues tripled, quadrupled because, of course, we stimulated the economy, more people were employed, so more people were, therefore, paying taxes. That is the effect of Reaganomics. It increased revenues to the Federal Government.

We definitely had deficit spending, absolutely true. Why?

Mr. Speaker, the reason is because this body, this body spent the money. Not only did it spend all of the revenues that came in, which were significantly more than had been experienced in the past, but it went on and spent beyond that. It did, in fact, deficit spend. So it was not Reaganomics, Mr. Speaker, it was this body. It was the Congress of the United States in profligate spending that caused the deficits of the 1980s, and it may very well be this body which causes that problem again. It may very well be, because no one can accuse us of being very judicious in the way we approach budgets.

In the last several years, because of the past President's urging and the fact that this Congress could not say no very often in terms of spending, we outdid ourselves. We increased budgets dramatically. And now, of course, we may have to look at reducing expenditures.

That was something that was never mentioned in the 1-hour as we listened to the other side talk about our problem. Never once did they say, we need to reduce expenditures. Every single time they talked about the problem we face, they said it was because we gave people a tax break. Now, is that not intriguing, and does that not simply tell us something about the nature of this body?

Today, Mr. Speaker, a newspaper which comes out every day here in the Congress, it is called The Hill. For most people, they may not have heard of this, because it is really just a newspaper circulated in the Capitol and around the Capitol, and it is certainly not a paper that I would call, or I think

anyone would call partisan in favor of Republicans. It is a very liberal-leaning newspaper; most of its reports have that sort of slant to it.

But today a very interesting headline in The Hill newspaper, especially in light of the discussion we just heard about the problem we are having with the deficit, with the budget, and about why we may actually be sort of dipping into the Social Security Trust Fund, remember, a fund that the other side spent 100 percent of every single year in the general fund. But now they have great concerns about it. Again, I am happy to hear that, I am very happy to hear that we have had sort of an epiphany for the people on the other side here.

But here is The Hill newspaper and here is the headline: "Senate Dems Wield Power, Feast on Pork." The whole article is about the degree to which the Senate Democrats, the Democrats now having taken control of the Senate, have gone bananas essentially in a spending frenzy.

Senate legislation would give the Corps of Engineers \$500 million more than the President requested in his budget, which sought to reduce superfluous spending by that agency. The Corps currently has a \$40 billion backlog, and there is no greater pork barrel project in this Congress than the Corps of Engineers.

It is everybody's engineering firm around here. Believe me, I know. I have tried to reduce the funding, and whenever we do, we run into a buzz saw around this place, because many, many, many Members see the Corps of Engineers as their personal construction company. It is not just unique to the Democrats, I should say, but in this case: "Senate Dems Wield Power, Feast on Pork."

We should take that into consideration, I say to my colleagues, when we think about the degree to which the words of our Members on the other side hold any water whatsoever when they discuss the issue of budgets and tax reductions and the reasons for coming up to a budget crisis.

So anyway, as I say, Mr. Speaker, these were not the original remarks I intended to give, but I simply could not sit here and listen to the other side discuss this issue without trying to at least shed a little light on the reality of the situation.

The real reason, of course, that I took to the floor this evening is to discuss the issue of immigration into the United States, massive, uncontrolled, illegal and legal immigration into the United States. I take this opportunity to address this issue, of course, because of the visit today and tomorrow of President Vicente Fox of Mexico.

I was privileged to be able to be on the south lawn of the White House this morning when President Bush greeted Mr. Fox, President Fox, and it was truly a very exhilarating experience. It is always exciting to be able to go to the White House, to be able to participate in an event of that nature, a lot of

pomp and circumstance and 21-gun salutes and all of the rest of it. It was very, very interesting, very enjoyable.

As I stood there with the crowd watching, I listened to both the remarks of the President of the United States and the remarks of Mr. Fox. To a large extent, those remarks centered on the issue of immigration.

Now, when I say "immigration," I think most people understand the meaning of the word "immigration," immigration meaning people coming from one country into another. In this case, more specifically, people coming from Mexico into the United States. "Immigration," that word was never once spoken by either the President of the United States or President Fox, interestingly, although a great deal of the time and a great many of their remarks dealt specifically with immigration.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues how they addressed it. Let me tell my colleagues the word they used. Throughout this whole speech, there were several times, from both the President of the United States and President Fox of Mexico, I thought, gosh, that is a different sort of phrase, that is a different way of addressing that particular issue; I never heard it like that before, they have changed.

In this debate about immigration, we have found that there have been many, many times actually that the words have been changed. For instance, we started talking about a month ago, I guess, and we used a word to describe a process called amnesty, the word "amnesty." The word has a definition; one can look it up in the dictionary. We all pretty much understand what it means. It means, if you have done something wrong, we are going to forgive you for it. That is amnesty. If you have broken the law, we are going to say, that is okay, no problem. Everybody go back to square one and start over again. That is amnesty.

Well, because the word "amnesty" has a relatively bad connotation, and let me tell my colleagues how bad it is, by the way. There were recently several polls done, the most recent is the Zogby poll on amnesty for illegal immigrants, but by the way, everything I am going to say in this poll is substantiated by other polls, by the Gallup Poll, USA Today; all of them say the same thing.

Consistent with other polls, Zogby finds that the majority of Americans, 55 percent, think that amnesty is a bad or a very bad idea, compared to 34 percent, who think it is a good or very good idea. The strongest opposition to amnesty can be found among conservatives with 60 percent thinking it is bad, and most troubling for those who are supporting this idea is that 32 percent of the conservatives said they would be less likely to vote for anybody who supported amnesty.

Among Democrats, 55 said they thought amnesty is a bad idea, 55 percent of the Democrats; 36 thought it

was a good idea. Some of the strongest opposition was found among voters in union households, a key Democrat constituency. Sixty percent of the voters in union households said it was a bad idea, compared to 32 percent who said it was good. And amnesty splits the party's liberal base right down the middle with 46 percent of the liberals thinking it was good idea and 45 percent of the liberals, people identifying themselves as liberal Democrats, saying it was a bad idea, 45 percent.

By the way, amnesty does not even appear to be winning Hispanic votes. Fifty-one percent of the respondents identifying themselves as Hispanic said it was a bad idea; 51 percent of Hispanic Americans said that amnesty is a bad idea. This according again to the Zogby poll, but believe me, every single poll that has been taken says the same thing.

So, all of a sudden, as a result, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this kind of information, these kinds of facts being brought to the forefront, all of a sudden, the word "amnesty" disappeared. We will not hear anyone who favors this concept use the word.

We have now changed "amnesty" into "regularization." Yes, that is right, "regularization." Or, another one I have heard is "earned legalization." These are the euphemisms that have been constructed to describe the fact of amnesty, but nobody wants to use the word because of the polling data that tells them, everybody is against it.

Do we know why they are against it, Mr. Speaker? They are against it because they are, in fact, logical, common-sense people, common-sense Americans. When we say to Americans, do you think it is okay for people to come into this country illegally, take jobs, many of them, of course, hard-working, nobody is suggesting that that is not the case, but do you think that that is okay? Do you think that we should reward that behavior with amnesty? Do you think it is all right that there are literally hundreds of millions of people around the world who would give their eye teeth to come to the United States, and who go through a process every year signing up, going through the application process, which is laborious, and hoping and praying that their number will come up and that the quota that they are in will not be filled until they get in.

And those people who do the right thing and come to the United States expect, of course, that they are coming to a country which is governed by the rule of law and not by the rule of man. That is the basic underpinning of the American republic, the rule of law.

So we ask Americans, do you think it is okay that those people who choose to ignore that particular avenue, albeit for probably very, very good reasons, probably because they are in economic deprivation in the country of their birth. They are seeking to get into the United States for advancement. Again,

I do not blame them for trying. But do you think that we should reward them for doing that? Is that a good idea, America? Do you think that will help us deal with our illegal immigration problem?

And America says, golly, I do not think so, to the tune of some 65 to 67 percent in the CNN poll, Gallup-CNN poll, 66 or 67 percent saying, no, I do not think that is a good idea.

So, therefore, in the speeches today, from both President Bush and of President Fox, we never heard the word "amnesty." Never. And we will not hear it emanating out of the administration or any of the people in this body who support immigration. What we will hear are these other things, these other euphemisms: "regularization" and "earned legalization" and all that stuff.

□ 2145

But I ask my friends when they hear that word to remember that it means one thing, amnesty, which means rewarding people for breaking the law. That is it, pure and simple.

They went on; both Presidents today went on in their remarks. I mentioned earlier that although a lot of the discussion revolved around the whole concept of administration, I never once heard the word "immigration" ever spoken. Never once did either one of the two gentlemen speaking today use the word "immigration."

What they used instead, and this is President Bush speaking, "We understand our two nations must work together in the spirit of respect and common purposes to seize opportunities and tackle challenges on issues that affect the lives of our citizens, including migration," migration; "the environment, drugs, crime, corruption, and education."

President Fox went on in his remarks: "Likewise, we want to continue making progress towards the establishment of an agreement on migration which will be of mutual benefit to us, and will recognize above all the value of migrants. The time has come to give migrants and their communities their proper place in the history of our bilateral relations. Both our countries owe them a great deal."

Well, that is an issue we will explore a little bit more here as time goes on.

Mr. Fox goes on: "For this reason we must and we can reach an agreement on migration before the end of the year which will allow us before the end of our respective terms to make sure that there are no Mexicans who have not entered this country legally, and those who have come to this country do so with proper documents." Once again, two or three times, migration.

Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between a migrant and an immigrant. A migrant moves from place to place. An immigrant moves from country to country. This is an important distinction which is attempting to be blurred by these kinds of statements.

I know these are small things. People would say, it is just a word. It is just a word. But these are important, very important. Do Members think it is odd at all, even intriguing, put it both ways, that both gentlemen in their discussions never use the word "immigration," but also use the word "migrant" or "migration"?

It is important. There is a distinction here between those two words. The attempt is to make us feel as though there is essentially no border; that the movement of people back and forth between what we now call Mexico, or by the way, which has actually had a name change in the recent past. Today when I got the invitation to go to this particular event over at the White House, I was intrigued because it said, "Please come here. President Vicente Fox, President of the United States of Mexico." That was on my invitation.

That was interesting. I did not know Mexico had changed its name from the Republic of Mexico to the United States of Mexico. There were all kinds of interesting really semantic things in terms of discussing this issue which I think are intriguing, to say the least: the United States of Mexico.

But the whole purpose of the discussion today was to make us simply think about the idea of illegal immigration as being nonexistent. And when Mr. Fox suggests that "there will be no Mexicans who have not entered this country legally," what he is saying, of course, is there is only one way in which that particular phenomenon could occur, one way. That is to essentially remove the border, eliminate the border in a de facto way and even a de jure way. That is the only way we would eliminate illegal immigration is by everyone coming here as legal.

There are people here in this body, there are people certainly throughout the country, who believe that that is exactly what we should do; that we should in fact eliminate the border, not just the border between the United States and Mexico but all borders, because, of course, nowadays the free flow of capital and people should not be impeded, and, what the heck, it is all one big world, anyway.

The European Common Market has formed itself into the European Union, they have established a single currency, and they are now establishing a single government in the European Congress. So that should be sort of the model for the rest of the world: that we should simply eliminate borders and let nature take its course.

If that is the case, Mr. Speaker, then I think that that is a debatable point. I hope and I pray that this body will debate that point, because that is the end result of our whole debate on immigration.

We have sort of talked around the edges of it: How many people, what should we call them, how long should they be here, how should we deal with the millions who have come to the United States illegally.

What really and truly people are saying, people who are pushing the pro-immigration side, and I am saying "immigration," mind you, not "migration." Migration is what happens if I move to Kansas. It is not what happens if I move to Mexico or Canada or Guatemala. That is immigration.

But when we talk about immigration in this body, and in this context, in the context of the discussions, the speeches given today by President Fox and by President Bush, I am concerned that what we really are beginning to discuss is the elimination of the borders.

In the June 22 Time Magazine, they had a very, very interesting series of articles. In fact, the front page, and I wish I had it with me tonight, I forgot to bring it, but the cover of Time Magazine June 21 says, "Mex-America," and the real gist of the story was that we have in fact, in a way, completely eliminated the border between the United States and Mexico, and that the Mexican culture, not just culture but many other aspects of life, has changed in the South, southwest parts of the United States because of massive immigration, both legal and illegal. There are, in fact, people who believe that we should do that.

Well, then let us get to that point, Mr. Speaker. Let us really and truly simply get to the basic debate point here in the issue of immigration; that is, should we have a border, or should we not?

Mr. Speaker, here is what we have to decide as a nation. If we want a border, if a border is meaningful, if it has any reason to be, if there is a reason to draw a line around this place we call the United States, then it is the responsibility of this Congress, uniquely of this Congress, by the way, and this administration, to defend it, to give it integrity.

What that means is to make sure that only the people who are allowed to come in by law are able to come in, and if that means defending that border with one's armed forces, that is what it means.

That is what we have to do if we want a border. We establish an immigration policy. Every Nation does. It says, here is how many people we will allow in this year; and by the way, not just how many people, but here is how many people with what we need in this country. We need doctors or lawyers although I must admit I do not know why we need any more of the latter. But we need people with various skills, various attributes to come into the United States, or any country. That is not just us, that is what most countries do. They say, here is who we need, here are the kinds of skills we need, and we will establish that as our immigration policy. We will defend our borders to make sure nothing else occurs.

The United States essentially has surrendered that degree of sovereignty by saying, hey, listen, we will wink at all the millions, and I mean millions, of people coming across our borders il-

legally every year; we will wink at the employers who employ them illegally, and we will do so because it provides profits for many employers, and in a way it provides future voters for various political parties. Let us face it, there is a very political issue here.

So we do not care about the fact that this Nation's population grows approximately 60,000 per week. That is the net gain over deaths and over emigration, people leaving the country, 60,000 a week. And we ignore the fact that approximately 70 percent of that amount is a result of immigration.

All of the issues with which we deal day in and day out in terms of the enormous strain on our infrastructure, the increase in demands, in the State of California, by the way, 95 percent of that State's increase in population over the last year, 95 percent is the result of immigration, legal and illegal. And because of that, Mr. Speaker, the State of California has to build a school a day to keep up with the demand. And, of course, there are highways, hospitals, and social services.

It has been estimated that the cost of adding every new person to any community is about \$15,200 a year, and that is the initial cost. It is not the costs we incur every year from that point on. There is no way that people coming into the United States today with very few skills or none at all, taking the lowest-paid jobs available, will ever pay back that cost. So all the talk about immigration being important for the United States, important economically, is hokum.

If we were to really be concerned about what was good for America, we would say that we will take in about 300,000 a year, and here is who we need, people with certain skills, high-level skills, primarily, who will come into the United States, become very highly successful in terms of whatever trade they are involved with, and become net taxpayers, not tax users. That is the present state of affairs, that by far, by far the people coming into the United States today are net tax drains on the United States over even in the short run and over the long run.

We tend to ignore this for a lot of other reasons, a lot of political reasons. I have developed a list of questions that I would like to be able to pose to President Fox while he is here. I have a feeling they will never be asked, but this is my only opportunity to present them.

I am the chairman of what we call the Immigration Reform Caucus in this House. I have many times attempted to contact the administration, the White House, and talk to them about this issue. We have been unsuccessful in arranging for a meeting to this point in time. Therefore, I have only this way of bringing these issues to the attention of my colleagues, to the administration, and to the people of the United States.

Recognizing full well that it is extremely important for Mexico to reconstruct itself economically in order to

provide a standard of living for its own people that will keep them in Mexico, will allow them to live in their homeland, will allow them to prosper, achieve a better life for themselves. Recognizing a significant change has to occur in Mexico, I would ask President Fox, in order to achieve that degree of change, I would ask him: Number one, Mr. President, exactly how do you plan to reduce the massive and pervasive corruption which, in your country, unfortunately is endemic? For everyone from the cop on the beat to the highest levels of government, we know, everyone knows, the world knows the level of corruption.

I had a gentleman in my office 2 days ago, in my Denver office, my Littleton office. He wanted to open up a business in Mexico. It is sort of a unique enterprise. He was not sure exactly who he needed to talk to in order to get permission from the Mexican government to import certain, in this case, tires to be recycled. And if he opened a plant in Mexico, he thought, how can I get permission from the Mexican government?

He was going around and beating around the bush. Finally he said, look, what I am trying to say is, can you find out for me, Congressman TANCREDO, who I have to pay off in Mexico to get the permits? Because he had done business in Mexico before, and anybody who has done business in Mexico and in fact in many third-world countries recognizes that that is the cost of business. That is the cost of doing business.

□ 2200

If you have been stopped in Mexico for a traffic ticket, I mean, I could go on and on and on. We know that the best way to handle it is to hand the policeman your driver's license and a \$20 bill, probably now more like a \$50 bill. It does not matter. The corruption goes from that level up to the top.

I assure the Speaker that until we begin to address this particular problem in Mexico we will never have a viable economy. NAFTA has got nothing to do with it.

We could have completely 100 percent free trade between these two countries. We would lose many, many jobs in the United States, but it would not improve the economy of Mexico because the economy in Mexico is stuck in two ways.

It is stuck in a socialistic enterprise. It still has not been able to get itself out of the old government control, government ownership. The government owns the oil industry. The most significant industry in Mexico is owned by the government. This is not a good idea.

If I had the opportunity, I would ask Mr. Fox, What are you going to do about that? Are you going to divest yourself of the oil industry because, of course, you will never prosper as a nation under these conditions?

What are you going to do, President Fox, about corruption? Tell me specifically how you are going to handle it.

President Fox demanded of the United States not too long ago, attacking our current immigration policies, and this was in Milwaukee on July 17, an integrated Mexican-U.S. labor market. An integrated Mexican-U.S. labor market.

Again, I would ask Mr. Fox, What do you mean by that? That is an interesting statement. An integrated labor market. I would like to know specifically how you define that.

He demanded that U.S. laws be rewritten to bring about open borders between the United States and Mexico and that we give illegal aliens in the United States driver's licenses, even though, of course, they cannot read the road signs and do not have insurance; and that we give Mexican illegals a university education and other taxpayer benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we do now presently provide K-12 education to all illegal immigrants' children in the United States. He wants us to go farther. He asked us to, in fact, provide university education to illegal immigrants from Mexico.

So I would ask President Fox, Will your government, the Government of Mexico, provide a free education, K-12 and post-secondary, to any foreign national in Mexico as he has requested of the United States? Is he willing to do the same thing?

I would ask President Fox, Since you own the oil company, President Fox, will you agree to sell the United States oil at below OPEC prices when that cartel punishes the United States by reducing its production? Because at a certain point, about \$27, they go, oh, it is too low. OPEC says we have got to decrease production in order to increase prices.

So, President Fox, you said that you wanted to be a friend to the United States. We have to build a relationship on trust.

Okay, I would say. Mr. Fox, let us start here. I want you to agree to sell us oil at below OPEC prices every time they try to blackmail us. What do you think the answer would be? I wonder.

I would ask him again, President Fox, What specific step is your government willing to take in the direction of increased privatization of the Mexican industry, Mexican economy. Are you willing to give up the oil company? Are you willing to privatize in order to spur economic growth?

If not, do not look to the United States to be your safety valve, to take all of your unemployed, all of your poverty. Because I assure you, Mr. Speaker, as long as we continue to do that there will never be any pressure on Mexico to reform itself, as long as we are there acting as that safety valve.

I will ask him, Mr. Fox, Will you stop the practice of handing out survival kits to those people about ready to come into the United States illegally? An agency of the government hands out a paper bag, 200,000 at last count, to people coming across the border into

the United States illegally, paper bags filled with maps, little how-to-survive in the desert, condoms. Go ask them what is the purpose. But, anyway, that is what they give them, some water.

Will you stop that, Mr. Fox? Because you say you want to stop illegal immigration in the United States, why are you promoting it by handing them out "survival kits"? Will you stop that as a friendly nation?

Will you publicly condemn those members of the Mexican Government who have called for the recolonization of the southwestern United States by Mexican nationals? They have done so. Bizarre as that sounds, they have done so.

I guess also, Mr. Fox, I would have to ask you, Why are you encouraging your people to take dual citizenships in the United States? In 1998, Mexico passed a law allowing for dual citizenships of their people. Since then somewhere close to 6 million Mexican-Americans, or I should not say Mexican-Americans because there are probably others involved, but so far 6 million people have accepted that particular identification as a dual citizen. Why are you doing that, Mr. Fox? I ask our own government, Why do we allow that?

When a person becomes a citizen of this country, they are supposed to raise their hand and swear that they give up allegiance to any foreign power or potentate, I think is the word that they use. How is it that you can have a dual citizenship and call yourself an American? How can that happen, Mr. Fox? President Bush, I would ask you the same question.

So those are some of the questions that I would pose to the President of Mexico, the Republic of Mexico or the United States of Mexico, whatever it calls itself now. Those are the questions I would pose. I hope that someone will ask them. I doubt if they will.

I will tell you that those are the questions I want answers to before I would move one step forward in the area of immigration, liberalization. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to reduce legal immigration in the United States from the present 1 million a year to about 300,000 a year.

I would, of course, take any action I could to stop illegal immigration. I would fine those employers who continue to use this form of illegal employment. I would put troops on the border. I would do what is necessary to protect our border; or I would say let us dissolve it. But let us have the debate here. It is one or the other. Either you have a border or you do not. Either it is meaningful or it is not. But before we go 20 years down the road and we look back and say, gee, how did it happen, that it sort of just evaporated, it is just gone, how did that occur, I would just as soon have us in this body debate that topic, have a vote up or down. Shall we eliminate the borders or not? If we decide not to, then we have to decide to enforce them.

MILITARY STRATEGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the Chair would recognize the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for half the time remaining before midnight, or approximately 56 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to address a crucial issue for the future of our Nation, the military strategy that will govern our armed services.

In 1923, then-Major George C. Marshall was asked to give a speech on national defense. He briefly recounted the history of the Army's end-strengths since the Revolutionary War and noted a consistent pattern. After every conflict the United States immediately and significantly decreased the size of the Army, only to have to increase it dramatically the next time a conflict broke out.

U.S. leaders continued to act as if the absence of an immediate threat justified a dramatic decrease in the size of U.S. forces and the defense budget. The astonishing fact, Marshall said, is that we continue to follow a regular cycle in the doing and undoing of measures for national defense.

Nearly 80 years later in the aftermath of the Cold War, we find ourselves caught in the same pattern. Our active duty military has shrunk from 2.1 million people in fiscal year 1989 to 1.4 million for the coming fiscal year, a decline of 34 percent.

Some in the administration may argue that this decline is reasonable and that further forced cuts are justified because we do not face a global peer competitor, but neither did the United States in 1923. Yet less than 20 years later it found itself at the center of a massive global conflict.

Mr. Speaker, this pattern must stop. Why must we as Members of Congress think about questions of national strategy? My first answer goes back to that 1923 Marshall speech that Congress and the administration must bring stability to the size of our force and the resources that support it, both in the current budget and in the out-years. Stability ensures the United States can counter any threat to its interest, can fulfill its responsibility as the world's lone superpower, and can live up to the trust all those who serve in the military should have in their government.

Second, the Constitution charges the Congress to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces. This is a sacred duty that transcends merely authorizing and appropriating annual funds for defense department and military services.

Remember, it was Congress that crafted the Goldwater-Nichols legislation that strengthened the chain of command to U.S. benefit in conflicts like the Gulf War, and Congress had upgraded professional military edu-

cation. We must now give thoughtful consideration to where our Nation is heading and what the proper role and size of our military is in this current world.

Third, I have had the great fortune of serving on the Committee on Armed Services for over 2 decades. In that time I have participated in scores and scores of briefings and hearings and have conferred widely with active duty and retired military officers, defense experts, military historians and, most importantly, our troops. Through their wisdom and generosity, I have learned quite a bit; and I have come to some opinions about what our military should be doing for our country.

It is an old speech-writing ploy to say that the United States stands at a unique moment in history, but in this case it happens to be true. There is no single overwhelming threat to the United States and its interests. There is no political-economic ideology to rival our democracy in capitalism, the United States the world's leading military and economic power. It has brought not only economic progress, but democracy and stability to many parts of the world.

On balance, the United States has provided great benefits to the world through its leadership. We should feel a great sense of accomplishment at that. But this elevated position creates responsibilities. The United States must continue to lead; we must consciously fan the fire of our leadership to serve as a beacon for those friends and allies who would follow us. We must work with them as partners without arrogance, recognizing that together we can make the world a better and safer place.

Leading in the 21st century means leading globally. The Asia-Pacific region is increasingly critical to our future security because of its population, growing economic strength, advancing military capabilities, and potential for conflict. Yet our leadership cannot focus on this region at the expense of others where U.S. interests remain strong, particularly Europe and the Persian Gulf.

In addition to requiring global leadership, our world position makes us a tempting target for those who would attack us. We may face direct challenges, attacks on our homeland, our citizens and soldiers overseas and our military and commercial information systems. We may face indirect challenges as well as those who resent our leadership seek to increase the cost of our global position and seek to block access to the ports and battlefields of the future.

We may face challenges to our allies and friends in conventional and unconventional forms that affect our own national interest. We may continue to face challenges associated with being a global leader as others ask us to contribute troops to keep the peace and stem violence.

Given the breadth of these challenges, our national military strategy

continues to matter, and the size and strength of our military matter as well. A good force structure with the wrong strategy is useless; so is a good strategy with the wrong forces.

Getting the strategy right requires asking what the military must be able to do. In basic terms, we ask the military to prevent attacks on U.S. interests and to respond if prevention fails.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, let us look at each in turn. I use prevention to mean two broad categories of activities that together protect U.S. interests, maintain U.S. world leadership, and minimize the likelihood that the military will have to fight.

The first preventive element of our military strategy is the protection of the U.S. homeland as it is our most fundamental national interest. We know of a number of states and nonstate actors that may seek to counter U.S. conventional strength through attacks that may involve weapons of mass destruction.

To counter these threats, the United States needs a comprehensive homeland security strategy, and I have called for this in legislation. To be sure, a limited missile defense system is part of such an effort, but the obsession of national missile defense by some as a "Maginot line in the sky" has become theological. Secretary Rumsfeld rightly points out that we cannot predict all of the threats that we will face, just as no one predicted Pearl Harbor or Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. But yet his strategy lacks the flexibility to deal with a range of threats when it puts such significant emphasis and resources on a single threat to be countered with missile defense. Missile defense systems should be treated as a weapons system like any other, and it should be only one part of the U.S. approach to protecting its citizens.

Homeland security must include continued support for nonproliferation programs, including cooperative threat reduction programs with states of the former Soviet Union. It must include great resources for intelligence and coordinated response mechanisms among a range of government agencies. Comprehensive homeland security, not merely the one element represented by missile defense, should be the focus of our efforts.

Beyond physical attacks, the United States is now vulnerable to increasingly sophisticated information warfare capabilities targeted at our military communications or at critical domestic infrastructure. The diffusion of technology allows many states and nonstate actors to target the United States directly through cyberspace at a fraction of the cost of confronting us with conventional forces.

Our own information operations war games, like 1997's Eligible Receiver, showed that even a small group of attackers could break into the power

grids of major American cities and disrupt military command and control systems. In such a scenario, our very technological superiority becomes a weakness with potentially devastating consequences for both infrastructure and the lives of our citizens and troops.

In considering how to deal with information warfare, the United States must build robust offensive and defensive capabilities and ensure that the information and communications that enable combat operations is secure. To do this, the Department of Defense should focus on integrating information operations into broader operational planning and on updating information operations doctrine.

The second preventive element of our strategy is shaping the global environment through active U.S. military engagement. The absence of this requirement in current administration rhetoric deeply troubles me. To speak of the importance of engagement is not simply a liberal effort to make the world a better place, it is one of the best means of maintaining alliance relationships, deterring adversaries, encouraging civilian control of military in foreign countries, and gathering vital intelligence throughout the world.

If we want to reduce the number of contingencies to which the United States is asked to send troops, we must pursue engagement as a means of preventing such conflicts before they happen. This vital engagement function takes two forms.

First, it requires presence, both through permanent basing and temporary deployments and ports of call. The changing global landscape may require basing in new locations. We should consider the use of an Indonesian island, greater presence in Guam, smaller deployments throughout Southeast Asia, and the shifting of more European forces to the southeast of that continent.

We must also be creative in how we use bases, adopting more of a lily-pad approach to basing that will allow us to use forces without overly stressing local communities. Frogs do not live on lily pads, but they use them when needing to get where they want to go.

Beyond presence, engagement must involve continued military-to-military exchanges and international military education. This is our best means of affecting the senior leaders' leadership of other countries and of building expertise in their cultures and doctrines. These relationships should be the last thing we cut in times when we are trying to send a political message. Cutting contacts discourages the positive changes we are seeking to effect in many countries.

In the end, our ability to shape the global environment to the benefit of our national security depends on a multifaceted approach, the linchpin of which is continued engagement and collaboration with other countries.

If our strategy takes these preventive actions for the homeland and

through global presence, it must then focus on required military capabilities if prevention fails. Without a credible, overwhelming warfighting capability, the United States cannot deter would-be aggressors and cannot maintain global leadership.

There is no simple, elegant proposition for the warfighting element of the strategy to replace the two-major-theater-war construct, but let me offer a notional "1-2-3" approach.

One, we must be able to fight and win decisively at low risk a major regional conflict. Two, we must be able to conduct serious military actions in at least two other regions simultaneously to deter those who would take advantage of our distraction in a major conflict.

Three, at the same time, we must be able to undertake at least three small-scale contingencies throughout the world. Our recent history has shown that this level of demand is simply a reality. Therefore, we should plan for it and accept it as the price of global leadership.

I have agonized, Mr. Speaker, over the risk of abandoning our two-major-theater-war force-sizing approach. While I know we do not currently have the troops to support it, I still believe we must determine our strategy first and only then determine the size of our force.

Our vital interests are spread throughout Europe, the Persian Gulf and East Asia, and therefore we must maintain the ability to undertake significant military action in any combination of these three regions. Many States continue to plow resources into conventional and particularly antiaccess capabilities. While it is true that Iraq's capabilities have been eroded by sanctions and North Korea's by economic stagnation, both countries maintain significant conventional strength. The Taiwan Straits remain a potential flashpoint.

The U.S. military has not given sufficient consideration to how the United States might have to respond if a large-scale conflict broke out between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. These are the presently foreseeable regions in which a major regional conflict seems most likely to occur.

Now, I agree with Secretary Rumsfeld that the likelihood of any two of these happening at any given moment is remote. Yet the United States must continue to have a multitheater capability. We must have enough forces to deter an attack of opportunity if we are engaged in a major theater war. For these reasons, I believe any move to a one-MTW capability must be accompanied by the ability to undertake significant military actions in two other places as well. These would not be "holding" actions, but a credible capability to deter adventurism and to protect crucial interests in those regions.

The third element of the "1-2-3" approach to countering conventional

threats to U.S. national interests is, the United States will continue to take part in small-scale contingencies in areas of lesser concern. At any given moment, there may be more or less than three such contingencies. The evidence of the last 10 years shows such a tempo is likely, particularly if you consider the continued deployments to keep peace in the Balkans and to maintain the no-fly zones in Iraq. Military planning should be able to contend with at least that number.

Many voices have called for scaling our commitments back and limiting the duration of U.S. involvement. We in Congress will continue to ask tough questions about how we get involved and how to complete the mission, but being involved is the price of global leadership. We must acknowledge this fact and plan our forces accordingly.

Finally, getting the strategy right means communicating that strategy effectively throughout the military services. Doing so means incorporating national strategic thinking into the outstanding professional military education system which already exists. Those in our intermediate and senior war colleges must understand how the tactics, operational art, and battlefield strategy they study fit within the broader national military strategy their civilian leaders devise.

We have the world's best military education system; an effective military strategy must ensure that excellence continues. As William Francis Butler so aptly said, any nation that separates its fighting men from its scholars will have its fighting done by fools and its thinking done by cowards.

When taken together, Mr. Speaker, these strategic elements are similar to those put forward by Secretary Rumsfeld. With the most notable exception of his downplaying of engagement activities, I believe he has gotten much of the strategy right.

He has also rightly put attention on the need to transform a percentage of our forces and to invest in certain critical capabilities. The United States must be able to protect space-based communications and other systems. It must search for increasingly effective intelligence capabilities. It must procure sophisticated stand-off capabilities to ensure that we can deliver firepower when confronted with antiaccess strategy.

Finally, the Department must further joint warfighting through approaches like standing joint task forces. The Secretary has already articulated these requirements effectively.

What he gets wrong is his approach to the troops. Technology is critical, but in many cases it cannot substitute for boots on the ground. Cutting forces directly would be dead wrong. The alternative approach of forcing each of the services to make their own cuts is even worse. This approach would force each service to make cuts in a vacuum,

and would abrogate America's responsibility to match force structure to the strategy it prescribes.

The stability then-Major George C. Marshall spoke of requires force structure consistency within an acceptable range for the health of our armed services. These services are only as good and effective as those they can entice to serve. Recruitment and retention efforts are damaged when end-strength numbers vary widely. Why should a young person commit to serving if he or she knows they may lose their jobs when the government next cuts the size of the military? Keeping faith with those who serve means maintaining a stable military base.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the strategy I have articulated here requires significant forces, in some cases more than we have today. The United States requires an Army, an Army of forces to fight a major theater war, to deter a second such conflict, to undertake peacekeeping operations, and to take part in engagement operations. If you consider that we used the equivalent of some 10 ground force divisions in the Gulf War, it is hard to see how we could fight one major conventional war while taking on any other missions with our current force. This and the reality of high current OPTEMPO rates argue for additional forces.

At a minimum, we should secure an increase in the size of the active duty Army by 20,000 soldiers to an end strength of 500,000, while maintaining 10 active duty divisions. Just last month, Secretary White and General Shinseki testified before our committee that the Army could use 520,000 to meet the requirements of today's missions; 500,000 is the minimum force size needed to implement this strategy.

In addition, we should support Army transformation efforts. The Army has given careful thought as to how it must face future challenges; these efforts deserve administration and congressional support.

Our strategy will continue to put great demands on the Navy for presence, ensuring access to conflict areas, and to providing firepower to those fighting on the ground. In this service, a greater number of ships, along with a modest increase in end strength, is desperately needed.

□ 2230

The Navy currently has approximately 315 ships. Over time, given our current replacement shipbuilding rate, that figure would drop to 230. Such a decline is appalling for a global naval power with global requirements. The scope of our commitments argues for a 400-ship Navy. This should be our goal. At a minimum, however, we should build toward the Navy's articulated requirement of 360 ships. We must also devote resources to developing innovative ships capable of operating in the littoral—such as a Cebrowski-class of "streetfighters"—as a complement to our fleet of capital ships. Such new

platforms may well have great war-fighting value, provide presence on the cheap, and serve as a counterforce to others' anti-access capabilities.

The Air Force is currently well-sized for the present strategy and will continue to play a vital role across the spectrum of conflict. The Aerospace Expeditionary Force concept is essential for allowing the Air Force to deal effectively with the tempo of current operations.

While the Air Force does not require greater force structure, it will need additional capabilities. The Air Force will need to recapitalize its aging fleet. In addition, the distances involved in a strategy more oriented toward Asia must involve greater airlift and more long-range capabilities, like the B-2.

Finally, the Marine Corps is well suited to both contingency operations and major theater war in the 21st century. In addition, they are developing urban warfare capabilities highly relevant to future conflicts. While Marine force structure is appropriate to their missions, they require a modest increase in end-strength to allow fuller manning of existing units and a relief to some OPTEMPO and PERSTEMPO demands. We must ensure that the Marine Corps continues to be able to provide the swift, forward action required by future challenges.

Taken together, these changes result in a larger force. The administration is right to say that we currently have a mismatch between strategy and force structure, but the answer is not to explain away the requirements of our global role. The answer is to size a force appropriate to the roles we must play.

Some might argue that we can accomplish these missions with fewer forces if we accept larger risks. This is a fool's economy. We must give the services the tools they need to fight and win decisively within low to moderate levels of risk. We must also lower risks to readiness by ensuring adequate forces for rotations. Mitigating these risks by modestly increasing the size of the force is the best way to provide the stability in U.S. forces that then-Major George C. Marshall sought in 1923. Only then will we be prepared to meet any challenge that will confront us.

Budgetary concerns alone should not determine our national military strategy. However, we must acknowledge the difficulty of both modernizing our forces and ensuring they have the capabilities needed to fight on any 21st century battlefield, without cutting force structure. Alleviating these pressures will require effort on both sides. We in Congress must keep national strategy in mind when allocating defense resources. President Bush recently expressed his hope that "Congress' priority is a strong national defense." I can tell you that for many of us, Democrat and Republican, this is the case.

But for its part, the administration must make the priority of national defense as or more important than a tax

cut. The military truly requires and deserves a greater budgetary top-line and a larger percentage of discretionary spending. The Department must follow through on the management reforms that Secretary Rumsfeld and the service secretaries have rightly highlighted to achieve cost savings.

At the end of the day, my approach is nothing more than Harry Truman common sense. Implementing effective strategy requires inspired leadership by the President and Secretary of Defense. I say again, inspired leadership. I hope the current administration will provide it. Conversations about strategy tend to stay within policy elites. But at its most fundamental level, the impact of this strategy we make is felt by every member of the service. They must have confidence that their leaders will consistently fund defense at levels that allow them to do their jobs proudly and effectively. If we fail to do that, we undermine not only our strategy but all those Americans we should inspire to serve.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to start off by commending the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his very appropriate and very logical comments which I will follow up on in a few moments.

Before doing so, however, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay my personal tribute to one of our colleagues who passed away over the break, the Honorable FLOYD SPENCE. I had known FLOYD SPENCE as many of our colleagues did in a very personal way over the past 15 years that I have served in the Congress. He was a leader on national security issues when I came to the Congress. He was one of those individuals that I looked up to for guidance and for early orientation to fully understand the role of the Congress in making sure that our military was being properly supported.

Congressman SPENCE, Chairman SPENCE, was one of those very unique individuals who had severe health problems, in fact had a major double lung transplant, and had gone through turmoil in his life from the health standpoint. I can remember the days when they wheeled him to the floor of the House in a wheelchair with a ventilator, yet he came back and rose to become the full chairman of the House Armed Services Committee and for 6 years he led this body in issues affecting our national security.

He was a quiet man, a gentleman, someone that never had a cross word for anyone, even those he disagreed with and was someone who would be a role model for someone aspiring to become a Member of this body. He had a

profound influence. During a time of difficulty in the 1990s when defense budgets were not what they should have been, it was Chairman FLOYD SPENCE who rose above the political fray and led this Congress in a very bipartisan way to increase defense spending by approximately \$43 billion over President Clinton's request for defense over a 6-year time period. If it had not been for Chairman SPENCE fighting tirelessly for our military, for the quality of life for our troops, if it had not been for Chairman SPENCE fighting for modernization and fighting for the basic dignity of our military, I do not know where we would be today, Mr. Speaker, because the summary I am going to give following this tribute to Chairman SPENCE will outline some very severe problems in our military.

Thank goodness Chairman SPENCE was here. Thank goodness he was fighting the battle. Thank goodness he was building bipartisan coalitions on behalf of the sons and daughters of America serving in uniform. He did a fantastic job in this body. He was someone who had many friends on both sides of the aisle and someone who will be terribly missed. I could not attend the funeral of Chairman SPENCE because I was in Huntsville, Alabama, giving a major speech to 800 people on missile defense.

It was only because of Chairman SPENCE's leadership that we have moved missile defense along as far as it has gone. As a tribute to him on that opening day of the conference, the entire group joined in a prayer together, a prayer of sympathy for the family of FLOYD, for his wife and his sons, and to let all of America know that FLOYD SPENCE has been a true champion, one of our real patriots.

It was just last April, Mr. Speaker, where I had the pleasure of recognizing Chairman FLOYD SPENCE at our annual national fire and emergency services dinner. We have two types of defenders that we support in America: Our international defenders, our military, and FLOYD SPENCE was definitely their champion. That night as we have for the past 14 years, we honored our domestic defenders.

Our domestic defenders are the men and women who serve in the 32,000 organized fire and EMS departments all across the country. We honored FLOYD SPENCE that night because 6 months prior, in last year's defense authorization bill, it was FLOYD SPENCE as chairman working with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who just left this Chamber, who allowed me to move forward legislation that created a grant program to provide matching funds for local fire and EMS departments so that they can better equip themselves to be America's domestic defenders. On that night, 2,000 leaders of the fire and emergency services from all over America gave FLOYD SPENCE a standing ovation for the work that he had done on behalf of our domestic defenders.

So FLOYD SPENCE's legacy is a legacy that all of us could look up to and hope

to achieve, one of supporting those people who wear the uniform, the uniform to protect America overseas, and the uniform to protect America at home. To FLOYD's family, his wife, his sons, we say thank you for giving us a tireless public servant whose legacy will live on forever, who did so much in such a short period of time and who will be so sorely missed in this body and in the minds and hearts of military leaders across this country and around the world where our troops are stationed. FLOYD SPENCE was a true American hero.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that following this brief tribute to FLOYD SPENCE, that I highlight a trip that took place the last week of August by myself and several of our colleagues. We are going to go into more detail next week in a 2-hour special order where I will be joined by my ranking Democrat colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), a good friend of mine, as he and I along with the other Members of our delegation go through in very great detail the findings of our trip around the country, a trip that I think was a first of its kind in the history of Congress, a trip that was designed to assess the status of our military's problems.

Mr. Speaker, most of the times when we in Congress take trips to military bases, they roll out the red carpet. They invite us to lunch with the base commander or the admiral. They sit us down and give us nice slide presentations, feed us well, give us a wind-shield tour of the facility and tell us how well everything is going. Those kinds of trips usually last an hour to an hour and a half. We wear suits and ties and the military personnel are all in their best garb and we see the best but we do not see the worst.

That is not what this trip was about, Mr. Speaker. As the chairman of the Readiness Committee, the committee that oversees the readiness of our troops, approximately one-third of our defense budget, my challenge to our staff and to the services over 5 weeks ago was to put together a trip that would for the first time allow our colleagues in Congress to see the real story of the status of our military.

I called the service reps in; and in my office 5 weeks ago, I outlined my vision for this trip. I said it was going to be a whirlwind trip that would go basically around the clock, have us engage directly with the troops, not pre-positioned people that would know we were coming with prestaged answers but, rather, a very candid and openhanded method of assessing the real problems that our military is encountering today.

We challenged each of the services to come up with bases that we could visit that would give us a real glimpse into problems that we know are there, problems of declining readiness, problems of the lack of ammunition, problems of the lack of ability of spare parts to keep our planes in the air, problems of

infrastructure, airfields that were not being maintained, buildings, housing, both barracks and multifamily units, problems with child care and schools and health care, so we would come back and be able to give to our colleagues in this body a full, detailed, accurate assessment as to whether or not we are living up to the requirement that is given to us as our first priority in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, as I was sitting in my office, I heard some of my colleagues talk for an hour about the President's tax cuts and how they are going to wreak havoc in America. I heard them talk about the need for more money for education, more money for a prescription drug program, more money for domestic spending, more money for foreign aid, but I did not hear much debate about the need for more funding for our military.

I pulled out my copy of the Constitution, and the Declaration of Independence which is the governing authority for our power in this country, and I looked up article 1, section 8, which defines the role and powers of the Congress. Mr. Speaker, as I assess article 1, section 8 and I see the powers of the Congress, I do not see anything there talking about raising the money to fund education in America, even though I am a teacher by profession and support the role of helping improve our quality of education. But it is not in the Constitution.

□ 2245

I do not see any mention in article I, section 8, of the Constitution establishing a program of prescription drugs for our seniors, although I support the effort to provide prescription drug coverage for those seniors who cannot afford it. I do not see any provision in article I, section 8, covering many of the programs that we fund in this institution. But, Mr. Speaker, I do see six separate parts of article I, section 8, that deal with our national security. This is not something that we have interpreted in the Constitution. These provisions are in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, under our Federal system, under our Constitution, one of the mandates, the primary mandates of this body, is to provide for our national defense, to raise an army, to raise a navy, to provide for the operation of our military. It is right there in the Constitution. Most every other thing that we do now is not in the Constitution by definition. In this case, our responsibility to our military is defined by the founders of our country in very clear terms. So with all the other rhetoric about all the other programs we want to fund, what bothers me is we are not hearing Members of Congress talk about our support for the military.

Now, in my own estimation, Federal funding for national security has gone down dramatically as a percentage of total Federal revenues taken in. In fact, when I give speeches around my

district and around the country, when I compare today's budget to the budget of a previous administration, and I usually pick John Kennedy, because it was a similar period of time of relative peace. It was after Korea, but before Vietnam, when John Kennedy was the President. We were spending 52 cents of every Federal tax dollar on the military. We were spending 9 percent of our Nation's gross national product on defense.

In this year's budget, Mr. Speaker, we are spending approximately 15 cents of the Federal tax dollar on the military, about 2.5 percent of our GNP on defense. I would agree that after the cold war ended there was a need for us to make some cutbacks. In fact, I supported many of those cutbacks. But, Mr. Speaker, many of us feel that we have gone too far.

Many of us feel that over the past 10 years two major problems have occurred simultaneously. I say 10 years, because this did not start with a Democrat administration and having me come up and just rail against a Democrat President.

This first problem actually started with the end of a Republican administration, 10 years ago, because that is when the cuts in defense spending started to occur dramatically. That is when we began those cuts that brought us down to a 15 cents on the dollar expenditure for national security, 2.5 percent of our GNP. Many would argue it is the largest continual decrease in defense spending in the history of America.

Now, granted, the dollar amounts that we are spending today are more than they were 10 and 20 years ago, but the actual percentage of available dollars and the percentage of our gross national product has decreased dramatically.

But at the same time that defense spending was going down, something else occurred, and that was the commanders-in-chief of our country, the Presidents, as allowed under our Constitution, decided in their wisdom they would deploy our troops.

If you take the period of time from the end of World War II until 1991 and look at all of the administrations during that period, from Democrat Harry Truman to Republican George Bush, Sr., they could have deployed our troops any time they wanted. They deployed our troops a total of 10 times in major deployments over a 40-year time period. In the previous 10 years, starting in 1991 up until 2001, we have had no less than 37 major deployments, a massive increase in the use of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, none of those deployments, except for Desert Storm in 1991, was paid for. In each case when our troops were inserted into harm's way by the President, we in the Congress were left to try to find a way to pay for the cost of those deployments.

Bosnia, we were told, would end 5 years ago when President Clinton promised the troops would be home by

Christmas. We are still in Bosnia today; and we have spent approximately \$18 billion of our DOD budget, unfunded, taking it out of other programs, to pay for the Bosnian operation.

Add in Haiti, Somalia, East Timor, Macedonia, Colombia, and every other one of those 37 deployments, and you see that while our defense budget was going down and deployments were going up, as our troops were deployed, the Congress had to find a way to pay the bill.

What the Congress did over the past 10 years, Democrats and Republicans together, was to take money out of that already-decreasing defense budget. That meant that we did not make the repairs on our military bases. That meant that we cut back on reordering spare parts. That meant that we did not build new base housing, that we did not modernize our barracks, that we did not build new child care centers. That meant that we did not build new schools.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a train wreck. We do not have enough dollars to pay for the cost of our military's operations. We are over-committed overseas. So this trip was to give us a chance to see what problems have been created at our bases here in the continental United States because of a lack of appropriate funding for infrastructure and for what we call readiness.

Mr. Speaker, what we found on our trip was outrageous and was immoral. We have an all-volunteer force today, risking their lives, giving their entire lives up to guaranteeing our freedom and security, which is the basis of our Constitution and our free democracy.

We saw living conditions worse than public housing in our inner-cities. We saw raw sewage leaking out of barracks, with a stench so bad you could not stay in the building, where the military had to completely excavate under the building because a pipe had been leaking for years raw sewage.

We saw showers on the first floor of barracks where our voluntarily enlisted military personnel had to take their showers with 3 to 4 inches of sewage water around their feet coming from the upper floors of that barracks because of improper drainage.

We saw drinking water taken out of taps that was so dirty and cloudy you would not give it to an animal, let alone a human being or a member of our military.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in Congress for 15 years. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), who was my cochair of this trip, has been in Congress longer than I. We were joined by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES), a newer Member, and a brand new freshman Member, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK). We were also joined by four leaders of the Pentagon, representatives of the Secretary of Defense and Secretaries of the services. All of us were appalled. All of us were

shocked. None of us believed that things were as bad as they are.

Now, on this trip, Mr. Speaker, it was unique, because we traveled over 8,000 miles in military aircraft, a plane that took off from Andrews Air Force Base. As we traveled around the country, because our crew could not continue to fly around the clock as we wanted, we transferred off to helicopters. We transferred off to P-3s. We kept moving from 7 in the morning until midnight each night, and we interacted with the troops on a continual basis.

When we arrived at a base, they knew we were coming; and they knew we were not going to be dressed in suits and we were not looking for fancy meals. We had told our base commanders that we wanted to see the worst conditions that existed on that base and we wanted to see when we arrived examples of what was happening, because of the lack of support by the Congress and the White House to deal with the ongoing maintenance of our facilities. That is what they showed us.

Each trip to each base lasted for approximately 1½ to 2 hours, and was filled with very real and visual examples that we documented and of which photographs will be presented to Members of this Congress in a written report, hopefully next week.

Throughout the entire trip, we took the media with us. Every step of the way, nothing was off base, no conversation was off limits. We had the media traveling with us to document what we saw. The Army Times, Navy Times, Air Force Times, and Marine Times next week will come out with a massive report on what we found, for starters.

Mr. Speaker, the way that you maintain a building or a property is to invest a certain percentage of the value of that property in maintenance each year. That maintenance prevents that building from deteriorating and from collapsing before its scheduled lifetime. The industry standard for maintaining what is called real maintenance is approximately 4 to 6 percent of the value of the replacement cost of that building, that structure or that complex.

In the military, we could never achieve a 4 to 6 percent rate, so our standard is 1.75 percent. The standard for the Defense Department is that we put 1.75 percent of the replacement cost value of our military bases in a budget each year, which is used to repair broken pipes, fix bad electrical outlets, take care of problems with housing and maintaining roadways and bridges and runways.

In our travels across America in 15 states, in 4 days, at 24 installations, no base that we went to in any of the services came within one-half of that 1.75 percent figure. The highest amount was 0.8 percent. Most bases were funding their real property maintenance at between 0.1 and 0.4 percent of the replacement cost value.

Now, what does that mean? That means that to pay for all those deployments that we got ourselves involved

in in the nineties, we took money away from keeping the quality of life for our troops healthy, and we used that money to pay those unpaid bills.

It was great while it lasted. The last administration was able to use money for the other purposes. Members of Congress were able to claim that we were balancing the budget. All during that time period less and less money was spent on maintaining our infrastructure.

We saw the results. Let me go through the results briefly. Later this week and next week in a 2-hour Special Order we will detail with a bipartisan task force in very great detail what we found at our military bases.

We started out at the Westover Air Reserve Base in Massachusetts; and there we found out, among other things, that we cannibalize one C-5A aircraft for every launch we make. What does cannibalize mean? That means because we have not bought enough spare parts, we have to take apart other planes and take parts off of them to keep a certain few planes flying in the air. Cannibalization of our military aircraft and equipment is now the standard. So to keep our military operational, we have maintenance people all across America at every base taking apart perfectly good aircraft to use those parts to keep other aircraft operational.

At McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey we learned that one half of the entire fleet of vehicles, 1,000 vehicles, need immediate replacement. What does that mean? That means that we do not have the vehicles to perform emergency services, that we do not have vehicles to maintain the integrity of the boundary lines of the base, because we have not replaced those vehicles, maintained them, changed the oil, because the money to do that went to pay for these deployments overseas out of a rapidly decreasing defense budget. The airfield lighting system was inadequate. The underground heating and air conditioning infrastructure was breaking down and had severe problems because of a lack of maintenance.

At the Naval Air Station in Oceana where we visited in Virginia, we saw encroachment, where local towns were being built right up to the boundary line of the facility, causing us problems in allowing our troops to train, with people that knew there was a base there buying houses and developers building complexes, and then the people who moved next to the base say we do not want the noise; we do not want the planes flying over. So the military has to curtail the flights, the pads and the abilities of our troops to prepare. We had a fighter wing command at Oceana in temporary buildings that you would not house your worst enemy in.

At Norfolk, we had a pier recently collapse. The entire pier just collapsed, where we station our supreme naval vehicles. In fact, the majority of our piers at Norfolk were built prior to

World War II or during World War II. They cannot handle our new aircraft carriers. They cannot handle our larger ships. They are not equipped. They do not have the electrical outlets, they do not have the supplies to maintain the water and power needed to take care of America's fleet, even though it is much smaller in the 21st century. We are working on those piers, but the work is not going fast enough.

□ 2300

In our air station in Norfolk, we saw nine World War II hangars that are still being used, but they all have serious deficiencies. The naval air station in Newark does not meet our antiterrorism guidelines, nor our force protection standards, and most of the barracks at the naval air station do not meet our criteria to have a one-plus-one standard of two soldiers with one bathroom in one living unit.

At Fort Riley, our next stop in Kansas, we saw old, inadequate motor pools. We saw military personnel being asked to change engines out in the driving heat, the drenching rain, and the freezing cold, because we have not put the money on the table to build new motor pools, because they are not sexy like an aircraft carrier or a B-1 or a B-2 bomber. I mean, who can crow about having built a motor pool?

So the people we are asking to maintain our fleet and our tanks and our artillery are having to work under impossible conditions, outside, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, because we have not given them the facilities with which to repair this equipment that we spend tons of money on.

Then, at Fort Riley, we have a provision that makes no sense at all. We allow the State governments to tell our military what buildings they can or cannot repair. If a building is old on a military base, instead of the base commander deciding where to spend the money, the State historic commission comes in and says, oh, no, you are not going to tear that building down; you are not going to leave that building unattended; you are going to repair that building.

Mr. Speaker, that is ridiculous that we have a State historic commission determining for our base commanders what buildings can or cannot be fixed up. If a State historic commission wants to repair an old building, let them use State money, but they should not have the power to take money away from the vital improvements needed for our troops to be put into historic preservation.

We traveled to Fort Lewis. At Fort Lewis we saw that 60 percent of our barracks are nowhere near standard. We have a major spare parts problem for every piece of equipment, urban encroachment issues and major problems with Army Reserve spare parts for helicopters.

At Whidbey Island out in Washington State, there is earthquake damage to a flight simulator building that occurred

months ago that is still not repaired because we have no money, no money for upgrading and improving these earthquake problems. Now, we can spend billions of dollars to reimburse local towns for earthquakes, but we did not spend the money for the military to fix the earthquake damage that they had from earthquakes and wildland fires and other natural disasters that have hit their facilities.

We have no wash rack for the P-3 aircraft. It all must be done outside in the freezing cold weather. A 50-year-old control tower does not even have a view of the entire runway. In fact, we heard about a child care facility on Whidbey Island where there has been a recurring problem of mold, where there is a lack of fire protection systems that would otherwise close that complex down if it was not on the military base; and at one point in time, they had the child care center closed down for a 30-day time period.

Mr. Speaker, these are people that volunteer their lives to serve our country. These are people who did nothing wrong. These are people who are working for our government who are providing a number one service required by our Constitution to provide for our national security, and we have let them down. Democrats and Republicans, White House and Congress, we have let them down.

We traveled along to Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho, the home of our B-1s, and as we arrived there and we were in the hangar looking at a B-1B bomber that had just been fixed, the commanding officer introduced us to a young mechanic. We were told that mechanic had just worked 6 straight days, 12 hours a day. Now, in the military you do not get overtime. We basically own you when you are in the military. This young mechanic left his family, including leaving and ignoring personal commitments he had with his kids, to work 6 straight days, 12 hours a day, to take parts off another B-1 to put this B-1 back in the air. Of the six planes in the B-1 squadron at Mountain Home Air Force Base, three are operational. The others are either inoperable or have been cannibalized, because the backlog for some spare parts for the B-1 is over 360 days.

Mr. Speaker, that B-1 mechanic did not join the military voluntarily to work 12 hours a day, 6 days a week because we did not supply enough spare parts.

We have one F-15, one of our top tactical fighters in our fleet, on the ground for 43 straight days being used to cannibalize it to keep other planes in the air.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the story at Mountain Home alone. I am giving highlights of each base. These problems are occurring at every military base we visited.

We went on to Edwards Air Force Base in California. There we have lost some frequency spectrum so they cannot conduct their normal routines

where our high-tech work is being done all the time. The training and testing of our newest equipment is done at Edwards, yet we cannot do it because we have lost frequency spectrum.

We have the oldest fleet of aircraft at the most state-of-the-art test facility in our national inventory at Edwards. The oldest fleet of aircraft for test purposes at a facility that gives us the most cutting-edge testing capability that our military owns.

We have a major problem at Edwards in keeping engineers. They no longer want to stay and work for the government. Even though our military has to maintain its cutting-edge leadership, they are leaving. We cannot get new engineers to come in.

We have crumbling runways and water problems in the housing area. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we brought back a jar of water that looks like it was colored with a kind of water coloring one uses to dye one's Easter eggs at Easter time. We took it right out of the tap and it was brown, because our water system does not have the proper treatment capabilities to drive out the solids and the heavy minerals that are located in the facilities at Edwards.

We went down to Miramar, the headquarters of our Navy and Marine Corps cutting-edge flight operations for the West Coast, and there we have a severe shortage of housing. Our young Marines cannot find a place to stay because housing in southern California is out of sight and there is not enough housing on the bases. We had parts shortages for our C-8-46s. We cannot keep our basic helicopters in the air because we cannot get spare parts to repair them.

In fact, we visited North Island in Coronado while we were there, and there we saw our major runway. This runway handles 300,000 takeoffs and landings a year, 300,000. The runway is in such bad shape that when they drove us out, we saw potholes in the runway. We saw pieces of macadam and concrete, they call it FOD in the military, that could fly up and if it got in an engine would destroy an engine, a million-dollar engine, destroy it, or could cause a plane to crash. Yet this is our premier facility for naval and Marine Corps aviation on the West Coast.

In fact, it was at the same site that we were looking at a terrible problem of a shortage of adequate facilities to house spare parts, inventory and equipment. They took us by a bunch of temporary buildings, buildings that no one would work in in this country if you were in the private sector because OSHA would shut you down, yet all of our military personnel were working in these buildings. And we stopped at this one complex which was basically a steel cargo facility that would normally be used to transfer port cargo on a vessel at sea, on a cargo ship. And there inside of this steel-enclosed cargo container was a Navy sailor who had been working in this facility for a year and a half. No electricity, no lights, no

water, no ventilation, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, young sailors finding spare parts with flashlights in what is basically a metal storage container to be used on cargo ships.

□ 2310

Mr. Speaker, that is not the world-class military that America is supposed to have. Imagine the morale of somebody who goes to work every day in a metal building with no light, having to use a flashlight to look for expensive spare parts.

Camp Pendleton, our showcase facility for the Marine Corps. We have allowed the environmental radicals in California to basically take over Camp Pendleton, a monstrous base on the coast of Southern California. As we flew the helicopter up and down the coast, we saw city after city along the California coastline built up to such an extent that one could not see open land.

Therefore, the wildlife and the endangered species have no place to go, not because of anything our military did, but because the city leaders and the planners and the State of California ignored the planning process and allowed families and buildings to be built side by side all along the coastline.

The only open area on the coast of Southern California is Camp Pendleton. The military then becomes the haven for endangered species. So what does the Fish and Wildlife Service say? You at Camp Pendleton cannot do any training if it infringes on endangered species.

What about the rest of the coast of California that caused the endangered species to have to go to Camp Pendleton, the only open area on the coast of Southern California? But no, what we are going to do instead of penalizing the towns is we are going to tell the Marines, "You cannot train here." So Marines, when they do amphibious assault training off the coast, believe it or not, Mr. Speaker, they have to put them on buses and take them under highways to get to the other side of the training area.

Our most widely used and best beach for amphibious training is called Red Beach. I am going to provide an overlay for every Member of Congress. Almost 80 percent of Red Beach, the number one spot for Marine amphibious training, cannot be used because of endangered species. And heaven forbid that a Marine come close to an endangered species, which California ignored while they massively built up their coastline.

That is the way we treat our Marines, those men and women that we send in first to secure the front line capabilities that our military has to have?

Forty percent of the buildings at Camp Pendleton were built during the 1940s and 1950s. The utility system is grossly outdated and marginally capable. They are making some progress, but again, brown water comes out of

our taps because of a lack of improvement to our water systems.

We went on to Fort Bliss, where the barracks are below standard. Advanced training facilities are rated as unacceptable. Two new water towers are needed. They are so old they are ready to collapse. They have low water pressure. Hospital and medical facilities are rated as unacceptable.

So here we have young people going into the service being told if they serve their country, we will give them and their family health care, we will give the family child care. We worry about child care for those people in public housing, but we do not hear Members get on the floor and talk about decent child care, decent health care for the men and women who serve in uniform.

We went on to Fort Sill, where our motor pools were too small to handle the modern equipment we are giving them. We had a roof collapse in a major storage facility where the entire truss beam fell in. The entire beam, this monstrous beam, just collapsed. They cannot use the whole building now. It is condemned until we get the money, who knows when that will come, to replace that truss.

There are 15-year-old barracks falling apart, with leaking roofs, leaking walls. There we saw something that is just unbelievable. We saw three-story dormitories or what we call barracks where the sewage system is so inadequate that when soldiers on the second and third floor take their showers, the water backs up in the first floor showers, so the soldiers taking their showers on the first floor are standing in ankle deep water that has just come off the soldiers that have showered on the second and third floors.

Mr. Speaker, if this occurred in any building anywhere in America, we would raise Cain. If this happened in a public housing unit, we would have Members screaming on the floor. These are the men and women who serve our country. Where is the outrage? Where is the demanding to hold accountable the fact that we have not provided the decent funding to repair these facilities?

We went down to Kelly Air Force Base, where that base has just been privatized and the other half has been transferred over to Lackland. There we saw F-16 aircraft at best 71 percent mission capable. That means 29 percent of the time they cannot fly the F-16. We saw part shortages for the C-5 and the F-60, not enough spare parts to keep the planes in the air.

At Lackland we saw an unbelievable situation. A sewage line under a barracks leaked. Because there was no maintenance money to repair it, the leak got worse and worse, so they had to go under the building and excavate it to find the leak. We went under the building.

The smell of raw sewage was so bad one would never want one's worst enemy to be stationed there, let alone living there. If American parents knew

that their sons and daughters would be put into barracks where raw sewage would be leaking underneath those barracks, they would demand our heads. That is what is happening at Lackland.

We had one technical training dorm that was so bad the entire dorm was evacuated and could not be used anymore. Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems were so old they were breaking. They had to move a fleet of portable chillers from one building to another so the soldiers and sailors and Air Corpsmen could continue their work, continue to eat in the heat, because the chillers had broken down because they had not been maintained and repaired.

We went on to Fort Hood. In Fort Hood, we saw something unusual, a couple of things unusual. We had a young female, and we happened to visit her dorm because as we went around the bases and they took us to housing, we would stop the bus and get out and go talk to ordinary people. We talked to some wives that were standing out in front of their moldy family housing at one site. We talked to recruits. We talked to young servicepeople. Whoever we saw, we went over and grabbed them to get some anecdotal feedback.

In this case, we went to a dorm or a barracks and a young woman was there. She let us see her room. This young woman went out with her own money that she makes, whatever that meager amount of money is, and bought a caulking gun, caulk, and tile because the holes and the cracks in her room were so bad that she decided that rather than wait for months and months and never get it fixed, she would take it upon herself to spend her own money, seal up the cracks, put new tiles in the bathroom, and try to make her living unit more comfortable.

Mr. Speaker, that is not what we asked of these young people when they volunteered to serve our country.

Then, Mr. Speaker, at Fort Hood, as we interviewed some more individuals, we met a young colonel who had just gotten back from Bosnia. He gave me a statement that I think should make this entire body, the White House, and the other body, feel a sense of shame upon all of us.

He said, "Congressman, I just returned from 9 months in Bosnia. I am a career military person, and I joined voluntarily to serve my country. But let me tell you, Congressman, we had better facilities in Bosnia than here in the U.S. That is why our morale is a 5 on a scale of 1 to 10, because of work conditions and housing conditions."

That was a young colonel, and I have his name, just returning from Bosnia, who tells a group of Members of Congress that he had it better in Bosnia, with our tax dollars, by the way, than he does at his own base here in America at Hunter Army Airfield in Georgia.

We also met someone else at Hunter Army Airfield in Georgia. We were in a

building where they maintain our fleet of helicopters. Hunter is important because that is our primary staging area for the Army of the future to move out quickly to respond to any situation worldwide. They have to be ready to go in 22 hours. That is their mandate, so they are our cutting edge.

In the facility where this equipment is maintained, there was no air conditioning.

□ 2320

Yet down in Hunter Army Air Station where this place is, it gets very hot in the summer. So a young private first class, new to the military, realizing the working conditions were intolerable, went out with his own money and bought an air conditioner so that everyone in his unit could have a cooler working environment while they did the job of preparing and maintaining the cutting-edge force for America's first-response worldwide.

We saw inadequate sewage treatment. We saw all housing facilities at Hunter declared unacceptable.

Our final stop was Fort Bragg, limited training ranges, only 60 percent of what is needed; 600,000 square feet of storage vehicle maintenance facilities not available to maintain this cutting-edge complex. Our supply and storage buildings are World War II. The largest barracks deficiency in the Army is at Fort Bragg.

We went into one barracks at the end of the night. It was about eleven o'clock on our last night before we came home. In this one barracks it was like a scene from a World War II movie. I thought we had gotten rid of these years ago. An actual barracks, not for new recruits, but for people being trained at Fort Bragg, open with about 24 beds and little individual storage lockers. No privacy, everybody out in the open in one common living area.

Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong here. There is something wrong when the men and women who wear the uniform to serve the country have it worse than some of the people in public housing in our cities. We have to bear the responsibility, Democrats and Republicans, White House and the Congress. We have failed our military miserably.

In my eulogy to FLOYD SPENCE, I credit him with leading the Congress with bipartisan votes to plus-up \$43 billion over Clinton's request, our defense budgets over 6 years. I do not know where we would be if we had not done that.

Mr. Speaker, we have got problems. To fix up every backlog of repair and maintenance today, the estimates by the Pentagon are \$150 billion. We could never meet that need. In a report that was mandated by last year's defense bill, the Pentagon said that we need \$4.9 billion just to catch up on basic maintenance and repair. So, Mr. Speaker, as a final response to our trip we are going to recommend that this body take action.

This is a disaster as bad as any flood. It is a disaster as bad as any hurricane. It is a disaster as bad as any wildlands fire. It is a disaster as bad as any building collapse. These are the young men and women in uniform who volunteer to do the one thing that our Constitution mandates, and that is provide for our national security; and they are doing it in substandard facilities. They are doing it without spare parts. They are doing it without adequate training. They are doing it where they risk their lives, not from their duty but in training and living. That is unacceptable. I challenge this body and the other body and the White House to come together in an emergency situation because that is what this is, and pass a special one-shot funding package that I am preparing right now, separate from our defense request by the President, to take care of these immediate needs. If we have to declare it off budget, so be it.

If there are others in this body that say, wait a minute, you will take this from some other source, so be it. This is an emergency. These troops deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to our men and women in uniform what I said to them in each of our stops, our 24 stops around the country. By the way, many of our colleagues joined with us. We had about 20 Members of Congress from both parties come out and meet us as we stopped at each site. This is what I told our military personnel: you have got to stop being taken for granted.

It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, I asked some of our troops at the bases, How many of you are registered to vote? In some cases less than half of them raised their hands. We in Congress have taken aggressive steps to have Motor Voter, where we register people when they go to get their car license renewed. We have taken steps to have people register to vote at welfare offices. Yet we do not do anything to encourage our military personnel to register at military bases.

I am challenging our military leaders to have a massive voter registration drive so that when a young recruit comes to a base, he or she is automatically registered to vote, I do not care what party they are, so they can start to have an influence on how we spend their money, so they are no longer disenfranchised, so they have a right to vote.

I also encourage this body to pass a waiver so they can choose to register at their place of residence or military base, whatever is most convenient for them. So they can vote as college students do, where they work. College students can register at the college campus where they go to school. Why should not military personnel be able to register at the base where they are stationed and still keep the benefits that would accrue from living back in their original home while they are serving their country?

If we empower the military, if the military speaks out, then our colleagues in this body will stop taking them for granted.

Mr. Speaker, some will say that yes, you are right. We should spend some money; and, therefore, we should take it from the President's request for missile defense. No. It does not work that way, Mr. Speaker.

The President has made the case based on threat assessments, that we have a new threat we have to deal with and that requires a significant new amount of dollars. To blame this shortfall on the President's tax cut or the President's request for missile defense is looking at and denying the fact that for 10 years we have not given the military the money they need. We allowed the previous two administrations to cut defense spending too low and not provide the support for real property maintenance and upgrades in spare parts and housing to support the quality of life for our troops.

We need missile defense as much as we need to support our troops, and the tax cut just occurred this year. It did not cause the shortfalls that should have been corrected over the past 10 years that my colleagues on the other side will now try to blame on President Bush. That does not work, Mr. Speaker.

It is time for us to come together as we did on this trip, Democrats and Republicans, House Members and Senators along with the President and demand that we deal with this emergency.

In dealing with this emergency, it is going to cost us money. We have to replace the dollars that were taken away from maintaining the quality of life that our troops deserve, the spare parts that our military equipment needs, the improvements to runways and housing and hospitals and child care to keep our military's morale up. If we do not do that, then we will have failed our military personnel, and we will have failed the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, next week we will do an in-depth bipartisan summary of the trip. Our colleagues will join us, hopefully, the 20 or so that were a part of this whirlwind trip; and together we will move forward to pass a supplemental piece of legislation dealing with the emergency needs that we have now evidenced in a firsthand way that our military has across the country, across all services.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HAYES (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of recovering from hip surgery.

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. HORN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CAPPS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GRUCCI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS AND A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 238. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct feasibility studies on water optimization in the Burnt River basin, Malheur River basin, Owyhee River basin, and Powder River basin, Oregon; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 329. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 356. An act to establish a National Commission on the Bicentennial of the Louisiana Purchase; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 491. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to the provisions of the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Denver Water Reuse project; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 498. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to include national discovery trails, and to designate the American Discovery Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 506. An act to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, to provide for a land exchange between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Huna Totem Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 509. An act to establish the Kenai Mountains-Turnagain Arm National Heritage Corridor in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 737. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 811 South Main Street in Yerington, Nevada, as the "Joseph E. Dini, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 970. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 39 Tremont Street, Paris Hill, Maine, as the "Horatio King Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 1026. An act to designate the United States Post Office located at 60 Third Avenue in Long Branch, New Jersey, as the "Pat King Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. 1144. An act to amend title III of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11331 et seq.) to reauthorize the Federal Emergency Management Food and Shelter Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

S. 1198. An act to reauthorize Franchise Fund Pilot Programs; to the Committee on Government Reform.

S. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution congratulating Ukraine on the 10th anniversary of the restoration of its independence and supporting its full integration into the Euro-Atlantic community of democracies; to the Committee on International Relations.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 93. Federal Firefighters Retirement Age Fairness Act.

H.R. 271. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center.

H.R. 364. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Majory Williams Scrivens Post Office".

H.R. 427. An act to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 558. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1030 South Church Street in Asheboro, North Carolina, as the "W. Joe Trogon Post Office Building".

H.R. 988. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse".

H.R. 1183. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 South Main Street in Sylvania, Georgia, as the "G. Elliot Hagan Post Office Building".

H.R. 1753. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 419 Rutherford Avenue, N.E., in Roanoke, Virginia, as the "M. Caldwell Butler Post Office Building".

H.R. 2043. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2719 South Webster Street in Kokomo, Indiana, as the "Elwood Haynes 'Bud' Hillis Post Office Building".

H.R. 2213. An act to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on August 8, 2001, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 2131. To reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2213. To respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American agricultural producers.

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on August 10, 2001, he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 1183. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 113 South Main Street in Sylvania, Georgia, as the "G. Elliot Hagan Post Office Building".

H.R. 1753. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 419 Rutherford Avenue, N.E., in Roanoke, Virginia, as the "M. Caldwell Butler Post Office Building".

H.R. 2043. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2719 South Webster Street in Kokomo, Indiana, as the "Elwood Hayes 'Bud' Hillis Post Office Building".

H.R. 271. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center.

H.R. 364. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5927 Southwest 70th Street in Miami, Florida, as the "Marjory Williams Scrivens Post Office".

H.R. 427. To provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon, and for other purposes.

H.R. 558. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 821. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1030 South Church Street in Asheboro, North Carolina, as the "W. Joe Trogon Post Office Building".

H.R. 93. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that the mandatory separation age for Federal firefighters be made the same as the age that applies with respect to Federal law enforcement officers.

H.R. 988. To designate the United States courthouse located at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York, as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 234, I move the House do now adjourn in memory of the late Honorable FLOYD SPENCE.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) pursuant to House Resolution 234, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 6, 2001, at 10 a.m. in memory of the late Honorable FLOYD SPENCE.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3333. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asian Longhorned Beetle; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00-077-2] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3334. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Fees for Permit Applications [Docket No. 99-060-2] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3335. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethalfuralin; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-301155; FRL-6793-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3336. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—2-Propenoic Acid, Polymer with 2-Propenamide, Sodium Salt; Tolerance Exemption [OPP-301157; FRL-6794-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3337. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of August 1, 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 107-113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for Fiscal Year 2002 budget amendments for the Department of the Interior and the District of Columbia; (H. Doc. No. 107-116); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests to make available previously appropriated contingent emergency funds for the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior; (H. Doc. No. 107-117); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3340. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Michael E. Ryan, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3341. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting an Annual Report on Fiscal Year 2000 Third Party Collections; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3342. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a Report on Fiscal Year 2001 Funds Obligated in Support of the Procurement of a Vaccine for the Biological Agent Anthrax; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3343. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Administrator of National Banks, transmitting the four issues of the Quarterly Journal that comprise the 2000 annual report to Congress of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Financial Services.

3344. A letter from the Group Vice President, Structured and Trade Finance, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3345. A letter from the Director, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3346. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3347. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Malaysia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3348. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Austria, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3349. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3350. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Mexico, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3351. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the People's Republic of China, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3352. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Brazil, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3353. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to the Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3354. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3355. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7511] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3356. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3357. A letter from the Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard; Final Listing of Model Year 2002 High-Theft Vehicle Lines [Docket No. NHTSA-2001-9831] (RIN: 2127-AI08) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3358. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—OMB Approvals Under the Paperwork Reduction Act; Technical Amendment [FRL-7028-2] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3359. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Kern County Air Pollution Control District and Imperial County Air Pollution Control District [CA179-0243a; FRL-7022-5] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3360. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7029-1] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3361. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [SW-FRL-7025-8] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3362. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Partial Removal of Direct Final Rule Revising the Arizona State Implementation Plan, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department [AZ 086-0043; FRL-7029-5] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3363. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana [MT-001-0018a, MT-001-0019a, MT-001-0020a, MT-001-0022a, MT-001-0023a; MT-001-0031a; FRL-7026-3] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3364. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clean Air Act Full Approval of Operating Permits Program in Washington [FRL-7031-6] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3365. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 118-1118a; FRL-7032-2] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3366. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [SW-FRL-7025-3] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3367. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Idaho: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL-7031-5] received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3368. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Alamo Community, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 00-158; RM-9921] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3369. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Bordelonville, Louisiana) [MM Docket No. 01-68; RM-10087] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3370. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Browning, Columbia Falls, and Pablo, Montana) [MM Docket No. 99-14; RM-9442; RM-9647] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3371. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Burnet, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99-358; RM-9783; RM-9838] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3372. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that he has exercised the authority granted to him to continue the system of controls contained in 15 C.F.R. Parts 730-774 and issued an Executive Order to continue export control regulations, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(b); (H. Doc. No. 107-114); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

3373. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, transmitting certification of a project for the Standoff Sensors For Nonacoustic ISR and ASW Project Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

3374. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Italy [Transmittal No. DTC 019-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 100-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 089-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3377. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 78-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

3378. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with France [Transmittal No. DTC 077-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

3379. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed

Manufacturing License Agreement with Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 094-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

3380. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 081-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

3381. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Singapore [Transmittal No. DTC 097-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3382. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Baikonur, Kazakhstan and Korou, French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 090-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3383. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Baikonur, Kazakhstan and Moscow, Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 098-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3384. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Baikonur, Kazakhstan [Transmittal No. DTC 087-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3385. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 091-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3386. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Canada [Transmittal No. DTC 080-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3387. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Brazil [Transmittal No. DTC 079-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3388. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 095-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3389. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to New Zealand [Transmittal No. DTC 068-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 096-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3391. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom and Saudi Arabia [Transmittal No. DTC 101-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3392. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Korea [Transmittal No. DTC 067-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3393. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Israel [Transmittal No. DTC 093-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3394. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Arab Republic of Egypt [Transmittal No. DTC 064-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3395. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Belgium [Transmittal No. DTC 082-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3396. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to South Korea [Transmittal No. DTC 076-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3397. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Italy [Transmittal No. DTC 070-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3398. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the Netherlands [Transmittal No. DTC 084-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3399. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Greece [Transmittal No. DTC 086-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3400. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Austria [Transmittal No. DTC 069-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3401. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Taiwan [Transmittal No. DTC 088-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3402. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental report consistent with the War Powers Resolution, regarding U.S. Armed Forces in East Timor; (H. Doc. No. 107-115); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

3403. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Israel [Transmittal No. DTC 092-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

3404. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-107, "Technical Amendments Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3405. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-120, "Ed Murphy Way, N.W., Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3406. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-121, "Closing and Dedication of Streets and Alleys in Squares 5920 and 5928, S.E., S.O. 00-86, Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3407. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-118, "Special Signs Temporary Amendment Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3408. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-122, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square 529, S.O. 01-1183, Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3409. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-127, "Approval of the Extension of the Term of the Franchise of Comcast Cablevision Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3410. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-129, "American Sign Language Recognition Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3411. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-117, "New York Avenue Metro Special Assessment Authorization Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3412. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-109, "Nominating Petitions Signature Amendment Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3413. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14-119, "Mental Health Service Delivery Reform Act of 2001" received September 5, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3414. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3415. A letter from the Director, Employee Benefits/Payroll/HRIS, AgriBank, transmitting transmitting the annual report disclosing the financial condition of the Retirement Plan for the Employees of the Seventh Farm Credit District as required by Public Law 95-595, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3416. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase From People Who Are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3417. A letter from the Acting Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National and Community Service, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3418. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3419. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3420. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3421. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3422. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3423. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3424. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3425. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3426. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3427. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3428. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3429. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3430. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3431. A letter from the Assistant Director for Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3432. A letter from the Director, Office of Headquarters and Executive Personnel Services, Department of Energy, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3433. A letter from the White House Liaison, Department of Justice, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3434. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3435. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3436. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3437. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3438. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3439. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3440. A letter from the Attorney/Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3441. A letter from the General Counsel, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3442. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

3443. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report on agency programs undertaken in support of the Federal Employees Clean Air Incentives Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3444. A letter from the Counsel to the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3445. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3446. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3447. A letter from the Executive Secretary and Chief of Staff, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

3448. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Arkansas Regulatory Program [SPATS No. AR-038-FOR] received August 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3449. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indiana Regulatory Program [SPATS No. IN-151-FOR] received August 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3450. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [SPATS No. PA-133-FOR] received August 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3451. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Early Seasons and Bag and Possession Limits for Certain Migratory Game Birds in the Contiguous United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands (RIN: 1018-AH79) received August 24, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3452. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Frameworks for Early-Season Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations (RIN: 1018-AH79) received August 16, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3453. A letter from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Migratory Bird Hunting Regulations on Certain Federal Indian Reservations and Ceded Lands for the 2001-02 Early Season (RIN: 1018-AH79) received August 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3454. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Annual Specifications [Docket No. 010718180-1180-01; 062901A] (RIN: 0648-AP01) received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3455. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Steller Sea Lion Protection Measures and 2001 Harvest Specifications and Associated Management Measures for the Groundfish Fisheries off Alaska [Docket No. 010112013-1168-06; I.D. 011101B] (RIN: 0648-AO82) received July 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3456. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries Off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Closure of the Commercial Fishery from U.S.—Canada Border to Leadbetter Pt., WA [Docket No. 010502110-1110-01; I.D. 071601E] received August 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

3457. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3458. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Labor Certification Process for the Permanent Employment of Aliens in the United States; Refiling of Applications (RIN: 1205-AB25) received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3459. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary of State's findings pursuant to Section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as added by the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, and amended by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3460. A letter from the Senior Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civil Penalties [Docket No. NHTSA 2001-9404; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AI42) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3461. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310, and Model A300 B4-600, A300 B4-600R, and A300 F4-600R (Collectively Called A300-600) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-160-AD; Amendment 39-12302; AD 2001-13-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3462. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the deep-draft navigation project for Savannah Harbor, Georgia; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3463. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment and Revision of Restricted Areas, ID [Airspace Docket No. 99-ANM-15] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3464. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Prevention of Alcohol Misuse and Prohibited Drug Use in Transit Operations [Docket No. FTA-2000-8513] (RIN: 2132-AA71) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3465. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace, Malta, MT [Airspace Docket No. 01-ANM-03] received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3466. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establish Class E Airspace: Hagerstown, MD [Airspace Docket No. 01-AEA-01FR] (RIN: 2120-AA66 (2001-0116)) received August 14, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3467. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-100 and -200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-327-AD; Amendment 39-12331; AD 2001-14-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3468. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate ST00171SE [Docket No. 2000-NM-237-AD; Amendment 39-12321; AD 2001-14-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3469. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas DC-9-51 and DC-9-83 Series Airplanes Modified by Supplemental Type Certificate SA8026NM [Docket No. 2000-NM-229-AD; Amendment 39-12312; AD 2001-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3470. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-102, -103, -106, -201, -202, -301, -311, -314, and -315 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-45-AD; Amendment 39-12301; AD 2001-13-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3471. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of Public Law 105-34, Section 1417, Related to the Use of Additional Ameliorating Material in Certain Wines (98R-89P) [T.D. ATF-458] (RIN: 1512-AB78) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3472. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Liquors and Articles From Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; Recodification of Regulations (2001R-56P) [T.D. ATF-459] (RIN: 1512-AC40) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3473. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Manufacture of Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes, Recodification of Regulations (2001R-57P) [T.D. ATF-460] (RIN: 1512-AC39) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3474. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Payments for New Medical Services and New Technologies under the Acute Care Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System [CMS 1176-F] (RIN: 0938-AL09) received September 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3475. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Deposits of Excise Taxes [TD 8963] (RIN: 1545-AX11) received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3476. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Classification of Certain Pension and Employee Benefit Trusts, and Other Trusts [TD 8962] (RIN: 1545-AY09) received August 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3477. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Low-Income Housing Credit—received August 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3478. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, first-out inventories [Rev. Rul. 2001-41] received August 7, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3479. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Modification of Tax Shelter Rules II [TD 8961] (RIN: 1545-BA04) received August 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3480. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Action On Decision: Mesa Oil, Inc. v. United States—received August 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3481. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—The Future of the Employee Plans Determination Letter Program [Announcement 2001-83] received August 8, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3482. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Proc. 2001-42] received August 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3483. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Anti-Deficient Act Review of the Defense Health Program; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

3484. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, Department of Justice, transmitting the Commission's 2000 Annual Report on operations under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2008 and 22 U.S.C. 1622a; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and the Judiciary.

3485. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification for Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (First Submission for FY 2001); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

3486. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, "Veterans' Benefits Act of 2001"; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of August 2, 2001]

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1007. A bill to limit access to body armor by violent felons and to facilitate the donation of Federal surplus body armor to State and local law enforcement agencies; with an amendment (Rept. 107-193 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

[Submitted August 31, 2001]

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. Supplemental report on H.R. 2646. A bill to provide for the continuation of agricultural programs through fiscal year 2011 (Rept. 107-191, Pt. 2).

[Pursuant to the order of the House on August 2, 2001 the following report was filed on September 4, 2001]

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2586. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 107-194). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on September 5, 2001]

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 717. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and services with respect to Duchenne muscular dystrophy; with amendments (Rept. 107-195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2589. A bill to amend the Multifamily Assisted Housing Reform and Affordability Act of 1997 to reauthorize the Office of Multifamily Housing Assistance Restructuring, and for other purposes (Rept. 107-196). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TAUZIN: Committee on Energy and Commerce. House Concurrent Resolution 84. Resolution supporting the goals of Red Ribbon Week in promoting drug-free communities (Rept. 107-197). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 51. Resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (Rept. 107-198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 2368. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Viet Nam; with an amendment (Rept. 107-199 Pt. 1).

Mr. NUSSLE: Committee on the Budget. H.R. 981. A bill to provide a biennial budget for the United States Government; with amendments (Rept. 107-200 Pt. 1).

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII: The Committees on Financial Services and Rules discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2368 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 981. Referral to the Committees on Rules and Government Reform extended for a period ending not later than November 2, 2001.

H.R. 2368. Referral to the Committees on Financial Services and Rules extended for a period ending not later than September 5, 2001.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2832. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Viet Nam; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 2833. A bill to promote freedom and democracy in Viet Nam; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 2834. A bill to amend section 526 of the National Housing Act to provide that any certification of a property for meeting energy efficiency requirements for mortgage insurance under such Act shall be conducted by an individual certified by an accredited home energy rating system provider; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ROHRBACHER):

H.R. 2835. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation to members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the United States who performed slave labor for Japan during World War II, or the surviving spouses of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL (for himself and Mr. GRUCCI):

H.R. 2836. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for equitable reimbursement rates under the Medicare Program to MedicareChoice organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT:

H.R. 2837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion

from an employee's gross income for employer-provided health coverage of the employee's spouse to coverage provided to the employee's domestic partner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD:

H.R. 2838. A bill to require the Director of the National Institutes of Health to conduct or support research using certain human pluripotent stem cells, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD (for herself, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. McCOLLUM):

H.R. 2839. A bill to provide additional appropriations for the fiscal year 2002 for the Peace Corps; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

H.R. 2840. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Dichlorobenzidine Dihydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 2841. A bill to designate the building located at 1 Federal Plaza in New York, New York, as the "James L. Watson United States Court of International Trade Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 2842. A bill to provide that Federal civilian retirees shall not be allowed to receive veterans' disability compensation while receiving retirement benefits, except to the extent that retired members of the Armed forces are allowed to receive such compensation while receiving military retirement pay; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to allow motions for a new trial at any time where the error alleged is a violation of constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H. Con. Res. 216. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative stamp should be issued honoring Felix Octavius Carr Darley; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HYDE (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H. Res. 233. A resolution recognizing the important relationship between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on International Relations, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H. Res. 234. A resolution expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of the Honorable Floyd Spence, a Representative from South Carolina; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

185. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 239 memorializing the United States Congress and the President of the United States to fully fund the federal commitment to the Individual with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

186. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to House Resolution 2001-H 6557 memorializing the President and Congress not to

allow drilling in Georges Bank; to the Committee on Resources.

187. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to Legislative Resolve No. 19 memorializing the United States Congress to fully fund the United States Coast Guard's supplemental budget for its operational readiness and recapitalization requirements to ensure that this humanitarian arm of the nation's national security system remains "semper paratus" throughout the Twenty-First Century; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

188. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution 01-S 0944 memorializing the President and Congress to impose a moratorium on major airline industry mergers in order to fully and carefully consider all consequences; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary.

189. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Joint Resolution 2001-H 6446 memorializing the President and Congress to impose a moratorium on major airline industry mergers in order to fully and carefully consider all consequences; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. ARMEY.
H.R. 17: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 25: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 31: Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 36: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
H.R. 61: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 91: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 134: Ms. BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 159: Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 163: Mrs. ROUKEMA.
H.R. 179: Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 184: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 218: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 250: Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. HART, Mr. HILL, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 267: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 278: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 281: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 292: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 294: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 303: Ms. WATSON, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Mr. McINNIS.
H.R. 336: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 420: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 425: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 448: Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 458: Mr. TERRY, Mr. COX, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KERNS, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 500: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 510: Mr. SKEN, Mr. JOHN, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 525: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 534: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HORN, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. REHBERG.
H.R. 595: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 639: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DeFAZIO, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 649: Mr. DeMINT.

- H.R. 663: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 664: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 677: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 684: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 699: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 713: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 746: Mr. REHBURG.
H.R. 751: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 852: Mr. PORTMAN and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 854: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 868: Mr. GRAVES, Mr. REYES, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 869: Mr. MATHESON and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 912: Mr. SIMMONS, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 950: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 951: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. KELLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. EVERETT.
H.R. 964: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 969: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.R. 1008: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1033: Ms. SOLIS, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1110: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1170: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 1178: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1192: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 1198: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. NORTHRUP, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. BALDACCII.
H.R. 1238: Mr. HOBSON.
H.R. 1252: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1254: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. Ferguson.
H.R. 1269: Mr. WATT of North Carolina and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1273: Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 1280: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1287: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 1295: Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1296: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WOLF, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. CANTOR.
H.R. 1304: Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 1305: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. GRUCCI.
H.R. 1319: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1322: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1330: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 1341: Mr. OTTER and Mr. MCCRERY.
H.R. 1344: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1353: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. PENCE, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1354: Mr. OLVER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1358: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 1368: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1382: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1405: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 1425: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1429: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 1436: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1438: Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 1451: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1452: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1487: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. OSE.
H.R. 1509: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 1512: Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1541: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1556: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 1564: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
H.R. 1582: Mr. HINCHEY and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 1591: Mr. FILNER and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1596: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1600: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 1601: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 1609: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PLATTS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1640: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1645: Mr. MOORE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1739: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1744: Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1754: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1773: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 1815: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1822: Mr. POMEROY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
H.R. 1828: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1873: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1896: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1904: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FRANK, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1911: Mr. BROWN of South Carolina and Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 1919: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 1948: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BALDACCII.
H.R. 1967: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. DEFazio.
H.R. 1969: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1975: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 1987: Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. OTTER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 1990: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 1997: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2035: Mr. BACA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 2037: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Mr. OSBORNE.
H.R. 2058: Mr. RUSH and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2059: Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 2070: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 2073: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SCHROCK, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2074: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. RIVERS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HOFFEL, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2117: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BACA, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 2123: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 2157: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2185: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 2219: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MICA, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 2220: Mr. ISSA and Mr. HILLIARD.
H.R. 2235: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2244: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 2258: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2282: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. BARRETT.
H.R. 2319: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 2329: Mr. OLVER, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. LEACH.
H.R. 2333: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. UPTON.
H.R. 2337: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 2339: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. HOFFEL, and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 2340: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2341: Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 2349: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2364: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2368: Mr. MARKEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 2377: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 2380: Mr. OLVER and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2391: Mr. KERNS.
H.R. 2405: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. HOFFEL.
H.R. 2413: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2417: Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. BASS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2438: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 2439: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. WATKINS.
H.R. 2459: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 2476: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2485: Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 2515: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 2517: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2573: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2592: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2594: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 2622: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. HORN.
H.R. 2623: Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. KING.
H.R. 2667: Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 2669: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2675: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2677: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2690: Mr. KIND, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 2695: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 2701: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2711: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2718: Mr. FRANK and Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 2725: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. SCHROCK.

H.R. 2755: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WATSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2778: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2779: Mr. LEACH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2787: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 2794: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 2806: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2812: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 2813: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2816: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2817: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HUNTER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. OWENS.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 40: Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 26: Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. FILNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. KIND.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. GOODE and Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 116: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Con. Res. 118: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 164: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. CHABOT.

H. Con. Res. 181: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. GOODE.

H. Con. Res. 191: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 194: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr.

TOOMEY, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. NEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOFFEL, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 195: Ms. WATSON and Mr. CROWLEY.

H. Con. Res. 211: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRANK, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 144: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H. Res. 197: Mr. KERNS.

H. Res. 224: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 226: Mr. TIBERI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. BORSKI.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2107: Mr. KUCINICH.